SRI

VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY

ORIENTAL JOURNAL

TIRUPATI

EDITOR

Prof. J. CHENNA REDDY, M.A., Ph.D.

Director, Oriental Research Institute

Vol. XV **DECEMBER, 1972** **PART II**

CONTENTS

ENGLISH

1. The Probable Sources of Deviations from Vālmīki in Bhāsa's Pratimā-nāṭaka
   Dr. J. Chenna Reddy ... 73
2. Vaśiṣṭha in the Vedic Ancillaries
   Dr. Umeshchandra Sharma ... 81
3. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Koṇḍubhaṭṭa on the Primary Denotation
   Dr. M S. Narayana Murti ... 87
4. The Tradition of Dedication in Telugu
   Dr. T. Kodandaramaiah ... 99
5. Murder in the Dharma Śāstra
   Dr. Ramesh Sundarji Betai ... 111
6. Iyaṟpā and Tirumuṟais
   Dr. N. Subbu Reddiar ... 119
7. Order of Enumeration of the Vaiśeṣika Categories
   Dr. Shrinarayana Mishra ... 129
8. Śivarāma, the Commentator of the Daśakumāracarita
   Dr. M.D. Paradkar ... 137
9. Our Indologist Mānavalli Rāmakrishnakavi
   Dr. P.S.R. Appa Rao ... 141

REVIEWS

10. A Check-List of Sanskrit Medical Manuscripts in India
    Dr. K.S. Ramamurti ... 145

SANSKRIT

3. उणादिप्रकरणं पाणिनीयव्याकरणं च
   Sri N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya ... 19

TELUGU

2. కళాసౌందర్యము
   Sri P. Balakrishna Murti ... 9
3. సర్వజ్ఞుడు - ప్రజాకవి
   Dr. G. Appa Rao ... 19

HINDI

श्रीकृष्ण स्वरूप का क्रम विकास
Dr. Chandra Prakash Agarwal ... 1

Dr. J. CHENNA REDDY

THE PROBABLE SOURCES OF DEVIATIONS FROM VĀLMĪKI IN BHĀSA'S PRATIMĀ - NĀṬAKA*

Bhāsa has written two plays in Sanskrit based on the 'Episode of Śrī Rāma', the main source for them being Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*. The plays are (1) *Pratimā-nāṭaka*, and (2) *Abhiṣeka-nāṭaka*. There is one more play in Sanskrit, namely the *Yajña-phala-nāṭaka* which some of the scholars tried to ascribe to Bhāsa. But majority of the learned critics have vehemently refuted that theory quoting profusely reliable data in support of their decision. I have also read a paper entitled '*On the Authorship of Yajñaphala-nāṭaka*' at the XXV (Silver Jubilee) Session of the A.I.O. Conference at Jadavpur in October, 1969.[1] I tried to establish the fact that the author of *Pratimā* and *Abhiṣeka* is, however not the author of the *Yajña phala-nāṭaka.*

In *Pratimā*, Bhāsa has made minor alterations or modifications in versions of Vlāmīki on many occasions. He has also introduced a few new situations which are not found in Vālmīki. The most important of the above two categories which have been pointed out by the critics are the following :

1. Episode of *valkalas* (the bark garments),
2. Sacred place (Temple) of statues of the kings of Ayodhyā,
3. The genealogy of the Sun-born *Kṣatriya* race from Dilīpa to Daśaratha,
4. Introducing Lakṣmaṇa as an elder brother of Bharata,
5. Offering of obsequies (thirteenth annual) - *tarpaṇa* to Daśaratha by Srī Rāma,

---

*Paper read at the XXVI Session of 'All-India Oriental Conference' held at Ujjain in October 1972.

1. Published in *S.V. University Oriental Journal, Vol. XII, Tirupati. 1969.*

6. Keeping away Lakṣmaṇa from the cottage of Śrī Sītā when Srī Rāma went in search of a striped golden deer,
7. Bharata's attempts to join Śrī Rāma with an army,
8. Attempt to exonerate Kaikeyī from the guilt of manoeuvring Śri Rāma's exile,
9. Performing Śrī Rāma's coronation at Janasthāna.

Majority of the above situations are also found in Vālmīki in some form or other and they have undergone minor alterations or modifications at the hand of Bhāsa, only to suit the tastes of scholars of the contemporary society or to achieve propriety, i.e. *aucitya*, or it may also be to facilitate easy presentation of the situations on the stage in a *dṛśya-kāvya*. The fact that only very few of them are of Bhāsa's creation can be proved with unerring certainty by tracing their sources mainly to the *Sārakāṇḍa* of *Ānandarāmāyaṇa* and occasionally to the *Pātālakhaṇḍa of Padmapurāṇa*.

1. Episode of the bark garments:

This incident is very well described in the 37th *sarga* of *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* of the *Vālmīki-rāmāyaṇa*. After Daśaratha granted the relevant boon, namely the exile of Śrī Rāma to Kaikeyī, he desires to send some army with a portion of the treasury to escort Śrī Rāma in to the wilderness. But Śri Rāma politely expresses his desire to have only bark garments to be supplied to him and nothing more, as

tyaktabhogasya me rajān ! vane vanyena jīvataḥ |
kiṃ kāryam anuyātreṇa tyaktasaṅgasya sarvataḥ ||
tathā mama satāṃśreṣṭha ! kiṃ dhvajinyā jagatpate ! |
sarvāṇyevānujānāmi cirāṇyevānayantu me || 37. 2 & 4.

Immediately Kaikeyī ran in and came back with bark garments sufficient for three people, as

atha cīrāṇi kaikeyī svayam āhṛtya rāghavam |
uvāca paridhatsveti janaughe nirapatrapā || 37.6.

Śrī Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa could wear the garments with ease. But Śrī Sītā stood perplexed not knowing how to wear them. Then Śrī Rāma himself went near her and tied the bark garments around her waist over and above the original *kauśeya* saree, as

tasyās tat kṣipram āgamya rāmo dharmabhṛtāṃ varaḥ |
cīram babandha sītāyāḥ kauśeyasyopari svayam || 37.14.

So the episode of Śrī Sītā's wearing a bark garment is only conveently arranged by Bhāsa to precede the publicity of the news of Śrī

Rāma's coronation. This change saves Śrī Sītā from an embarrassing position of wearing those garments in the presence of so many male members other than her husband It also gives-in the form of a technical dramatic irony - more effect to the scene as it is in a *dṛśya-kāvya*.

2 *The introduction of statues of Śrī Rāma's predecessors in a sacred temple* :

According to Vālmīki, Bharata was living with his maternal uncle at a place far removed from Ayodhyā for the past twelve years which is the interval between the day of marriages of the four princes at Mithilā and the day of Śrī Rāma's exile from Ayodhyā Bharata was invited to Ayodhyā only after the death of his father though the news was not revealed to him till he reached the palace. In Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* which is a *śravya-kāvya* the dead body of Daśaratha preserved in a *taila-droṇi* (tub of scented oil) played the role of *ālambana-vibhāva* to Bharata's pathos, as

uddhṛtaṃ tailasaṃrodhāt sa tu bhūmau niveśitam /
āpītavarṇavadanam prasuptam iva bhūpatim //
saṃveśya śayane cāgrye nānāratnapariṣkṛte /
tato daśaratham putro vilalāpa suduḥkhitaḥ // 76.4.5.

In the *dṛśya-kāvya*, i. e. the *Pratimā-nāṭaka*, Bhāsa could not exhibit a corpse on the stage, so he has created the scene of presenting the statues of four departed kings of Ayodhyā among which Bharata finds the statue of his father Daśaratha which indicates his death.

3. *The genealogy of the Sun-born Kṣatriya race from Dilīpa to Daśaratha*:

The genealogy which is relevant here does not agree with that described in the *Bālakāṇḍa* of *Vālmiki*'s *Rāmāyaṇa* - nor does it agree with that described in the ninth *Skandha* of the *Mahā-bhāgavata-purāṇa.* The order given in *Pratimā* by Bhāsa agrees with those given in the *Harivaṃśa* as well as in the *Sārakāṇḍa* of *Ānanda-rāmāyaṇa*. So Bhāsa might have taken one of the above two works as sources for this order. For several reasons which are substantiated in the following paragraphs, I can confidently say that Bhāsa has taken this particular order of kings from the *Sārakāṇḍa* only and not from the *Harivaṃśa*. The version in *Sārakāṇḍa* is as follows :

.... khaṭvāṅgād dīrghabāhukaḥ /
dilīpaś ca sa evātra tasya putro raghuḥ smṛtaḥ //
raghoḥ putro hy ajaḥ proktastasmād daśarathaḥ smṛtaḥ //
1.26-27.

It is more probable that Kālidāsa a later poet who has given the same order in his *Raghuvaṃśa-mahākāvya* has followed the *Harivaṃśa* only.

4. *Introducing Lakṣmaṇa as an elder brother of Bharata*:

In *Pratimā*, Bharata addresses Lakṣmaṇa as *ārya* which term unmistakably reveals that Bhāsa intentionally used that term only to indicate that Lakṣmaṇa is elder to Bharata. This is against Vālmīki. In Vālmīki the parts of the couplets *'puṣye jātas tu bharataḥ'*, *'sārpe jātau tu saumitrī'* clearly state that Bharata is elder to Lakṣmaṇa. It is another instance to prove the fact that Bhāsa took this order only from the *Sārakāṇḍa* of *Ānanda-rāmāyaṇa*. In the beginning of the second *Sarga* of *Sārakāṇḍa* it is stated that after Śrī Rāma was born to Kausalyā, Sumitrā gave birth to Lakṣmaṇa, and Kaikeyī to Bharata and Śatrughna afterwards, as

tataḥ sumitrāpurataḥ śeṣo 'bhūd bālarūpadhṛk /
āvirbhūtau dvau yamalau kaikeyyāḥ śaṃkhacakrake //

It is clearly stated in the *Sārakāṇḍa* that Lakṣmaṇa was the only son of Sumitrā and Bharata and Śatrughna were the twin born children of Kaikeyī. The *Sārakāṇḍa* also mentioned this fact as a reason for the closer fraternal attachment between Bharata and Śatrughna, as

atha vavṛdhire sarve lakṣmaṇo rāghaveṇa hi /
śatrughno bharatenāpi cakāra krīḍanādikam // 2.12.

5. *Offering of obsequies (thirteenth annual) - tarpaṇa to Daśaratha by Śrī Rāma.*

In he *Āraṇyakāṇḍa* of Valmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, Mārīca appears before Śrī Sītā in the from of a golden deer. Śrī Sītā gets attracted by its glittering appearance and expresses her desire to have it alive Immediately Śrī Rāma gets ready to catch hold of the deer with an indiffenent attitude to evil consequences. Lakṣmaṇa being a little sober minded reminds Śri Rāma in vain of the vile nature of Mārīca and his presence near their cottage. Even then Śrī Sītā insists on her desire to be fulfilled and Śrī Rāma blindly runs after the deer. This incident might have given an impression to Bhāsa that both Śrī Rāma and Śrī Sītā behaved like common rustic people.

Here Bhāsa intended to save Śrī Rāma and Śrī Sītā from public criticism for their hasty behaviour. The result is the creation by him in *Pratimā* of the scene of Śrī Rāma's offering *tarpaṇa* to his father. Rāvaṇa scented the weakness of Śrī Rāma in the form of extreme devoutness to his father That was the day of thirteenth death anniversary of Daśaratha. Rāvaṇa appeared before Śrī Rāma in the guise of a pious *brāhmaṇa* and quoted some scriptures which prescribe the flesh of a particular species of deer as the best offering to his father. Presently as planned before Mārīca appeared in the form of a golden deer with desired stripes and Śrī Rāma ran after it. Rāvaṇa availed this opportunity to carry away Śrī Sītā.

6. *Keeping away Lakṣmaṇa from the cottage of Śrī Sītā when Śrī Rāma went in search of a striped golden deer :*

In the version of Vālmīki, Mārīca hit by the arrow of Śrī Rāma raises an alarming voice imitating that of Śrī Rāma. Then Śrī Sītā entreats Lakṣmaṇa to run for Śrī Rāma's rescue. He tries to convince her about the invincibility of Śrī Rāma. Growing impatient Śrī Sītā scolds Lakṣmaṇa attributing some indecent motives for his reluctance to leave the cottage. Bhāsa perhaps did not like to depict these three noble characters in an ignoble manner. So he created a situation wherein Lakṣmaṇa was sent by Śrī Rāma to receive the great sages at the time when Rāvaṇa visited the cottage. It has served two purposes at a time.

7. *Bharata's attempts to join Śrī Rāma with an army*:

In Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* it is nowhere indicated that Bharata knows the movements or whereabouts of Śrī Rāma after he received his sandals *(padukas)* from him. In the eleventh *sarga* of the *Sārakāṇḍa* there is a situation when Hanumān meets Bharata at Sāketa and narrates the story of Śrī Rāma to him. While returning to Laṅkā carrying Droṇagiri with all its celestial medicinal herbs to save Lakṣmaṇa from the mortal blow inflicted by Rāvaṇa, Hanumān mistakes Bharata standing in the open at Sāketa to be Śrī Rāma himself as the physical features of the brothers were identical. On hearing from Hanumān the great calamity that has befallen Śrī Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, Bharata collects an army and starts to Laṅkā to help Śrī Rāma in the battle against Rāvaṇa, as

nṛpān ākārayāmāsa sāketam bharato 'pi saḥ |
sāhāyyārthaṃ rāghavasya laṅkāṃ gantum mano dadhe | 11.77.

At the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, Śrī Rāma halts at Bharadvāja's hermitage on the outskirts of Sāketa on his way back to Ayodhyā after killing Rāvaṇa and sends Hanumān to Bharata with instructions to watch and know by his facial expressions whether Bharata is interested in retaining for ever the kingdom for himself. This incident evidently was not appealing to Bhāsa. So, to establish also Bharata's unstinted loyalty to Śrī Rāma, Bhāsa has introduced this change taking from the *Sārakāṇḍa* only.

8. *Attempt to exonerate Kaikeyī from the guilt of manoeuvring Śrī Rāma's exile.*

The attempts to exonerate Kaikeyī from this guilt are made by several Sanskrit playwrights including Rājaśekhara the author of the *Bālarāmāyaṇa*. Bhāsa also introduced the same theme but not indirectly as others did. This also he has taken from the sixth *sarga* of the *Sārakāṇḍa*. When Bharata receives Śrī Rāma's sandals at Citrakūṭa, Kaikeyī also was present there. She was burning with repentence for her act of caus-

ing exile to Śrī Rāma. She requests Śrī Rāma to excuse her for that infamous act, as

> *samprārthayat kaikeyī sā rāmacandram punaḥ punaḥ |*
> *mayāparādhitaṃ rāma! tat kṣantavyaṃ raghūttama! ||* 6.112.

Śrī Rāma simply smiled and replied that everything was preplanned by himself and Manthara and Kaikeyī were used only as tools in this affair, as

> *tām āha rāmacandro 'pi na tvayā me 'parādhitam |*
> *macchandān mantharāvākyāt tvaṃ vāṇyā mohitā tadā ||*
> *sukhaṃ gacchāmba ! svapurīm na krodho 'sti mama tvayi ||*
> 6.113-114.

In Vālmīki, Śrī Rāma's character is depicted only as a human hero with all the human weaknesses but endowed with enormous quantity of valour. In the *Sārakāṇḍa* he is depicted with all devine qualities as described in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* in the case of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

But Bhāsa could not succeed to the satisfaction of the critics in his attempt to exonerate Kaikeyī from her guilt. It is purely artificial.

9. Coronation of Śrī Rāma in Janasthāna :

It is not a great change. Bhāsa might have taken it as a fancy to bring Bharata and his paraphernalia to Śrī Rāma while he was at Janasthāna instead of Śri Rāma going to Bharata living in Sāketa. It is also significant that Bharata has taken responsibility of kingdom from Śrī Rāma in Citrakūṭa - a forest - now he entrusts the same responsibility to Śrī Rāma in Janasthāna - also a forest. It may also be for avoiding writing another act in the play and for obviating additional stage equipment, etc.

As regards the *Ānandarāmāyaṇa* and *Padmapurāṇa*, genuine doubts were raised by some scholars about the date of their origin. In the case of the *Pātālakhaṇḍa* of *Padmapurāṇa*, eminent scholars like Dr. M. Winternitz held the view that the nucleus of Śrī Rāma's story must have had an ancient origin[1].

Even in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* it is generally agreed that there are interpolations *extending to several sargas and Adhyāyās*. Dr. Suktankar in his articles[2] "*Rāma Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa*" and "*Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa*" explains it. The *Bhāratamañjarī* of Kṣemendra does not contain the abridgment of 12 Adyāyās

1. *A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I,* Page 544.
2. *Suktankar Memorial Volume 1,* pp. 387-402 and 406-415.

(342 to 353) in the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* of *Sāntiparvan*. Evidently those chapters have been added on to the *Mahābhārata* after the 10th century. So also the *Ānandarāmāyaṇa* might contain other *Kāṇḍas* added on to it later by interested persons belonging to a particular religious denomination, while the bulk of the *Sārakānda* is sure to form the ancient nucleus of Śrī Rāma's story.

Dr. UMESH CHANDRA SHARMA

VASIṢṬHA IN THE VEDIC ANCILLARIES

The Vedic ancillaries have preserved and amplified to a great extent certain legends connected with Vasiṣṭha's life. The main purpose of these treatises, however, has been to help in the interpretation of the *Veda* from various points of view. The personal life of some *Ṛṣi* or other is dealt with only when the context required it and when it became imminent for the understanding of the real background of the *sūkta* or *ṛk*. Vasiṣṭha, being the foremost contributor to the Vedic composition, found a definite and prominent place in these treatises. The relevant portions from these texts are being perused and discussed here.

In the *Nirukta* (Nir) Yāska refers to the birth of Vasiṣṭha[1] and then comments on the Ṛgvedic verse-*utāsi maitrā varuṇo vasiṣṭhaḥ*[2] in this connection. Here, Vasiṣṭha is said to be the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, and Ūrvaśī. The semen of the twin-gods dropped down at Ūrvaśī's sight. The Viśvedevas held it in a pitcher, full of water. Then Vasiṣṭha was born from this semen. This fact is supported by RV also.[3]

It is said in Nir that Parāśara, the grandson of Vasiṣṭha and the son of Śakti, was born to the old and decrepit *(parā śirṇasya)* Vasiṣṭha, therefore, he was named as Parāśara.[4] The Ṛgvedic verse-*parāśaraḥ satayātur vasiṣṭhaḥ*[5] is also quoted here, which asserts Vasiṣṭha's loyalty to Indra.

It is also stated that Vasiṣtha could not bear the sorrow of his sons' death. He threw himself away into the river, having tied his body with thread, with the intention of ending his life. But the river discon-

1. Nir. V. 14
2. RV. VII. 33.11
3. ibid. 10-14
4. Nir. VI. 30
5. RV. VII. 18.21.

nected his bonds and thus he survived. From this time onwards the river came to be known as Vipāṭ.[6]

Finally, Yāska describes the peculiar characteristics of the Vasiṣṭhas.[7] "Their splendour is dazzling like that of the sun, their greatness is unfathomed like that of ocean, their speed is like that of the wind. Your hymn, O Vasiṣṭha ! cannot be imitated by any other."

The *Bṛhaddevatā* of Śaunaka (BD) has the following information regarding Vasiṣṭha :

It says that the Sun-god acquired the name Bhaga, because the seer Vasiṣṭha calls him as Bhaga, in the *sūktas* addressed to him.[8] At another place it is mentioned that the character of Vaiśvadeva hymns, differs from seer to seer. Here, the name of Vasiṣṭha is mentioned among others [9] Vasiṣṭha's *Āprī* hymns contain Narāśaṃsa; he is the son of Ūrvaśī.[10] In *Bharadvāja, Gṛtsamada* and *Vasiṣṭha Maṇḍalas*, there are no similar refrains in hymns addressed either to many divinities or to two gods.[11] The seers Vasiṣṭha, etc., when praised at the beginning, end, or middle of a hymn, in hymns addressed to Savitṛ, Soma, etc., do not interfere with the deities who own the hymn.[12]

BD points out[13] to the four stanzas in third *Maṇḍala* of RV,[14] which are styled by it as being hostile to the Vasiṣṭhas *(vasiṣṭhavdeṣiṇyaḥ)*. These are seen by Viśvāmitra and are traditionally held to be imprecations against the enemy. This enemy is presumed to be Vasiṣṭha. The Vasiṣṭhas do not listen to them. Great sin arises from reciting or listening to them. Those who do not follow this rule and recite and hear them, get their heads broken into hundred pieces, their children die. Hence those stanzas should not be uttered.

BD gives the complete pedigree of Vasiṣṭha including his birth quite systematically. It will be worthwhile to discuss it as a whole :

"The son of Prajāpati was Marīci, and Marīci's son was the sage Kāśyapa. He had thirteen divine wives, the daughters of Dakṣa : Aditi, Diti, Danu, Kālā, Danāyu, Siṃhikā, Muni, Krodhā, Viśvā, Variṣṭhā, Surabhi, Vinatā, and Kadrū by name; (these) daughters he (Dakṣa) gave

6. *vipād vipāṭanād vā vapāśanād vā*, Nir. IX. 26
7. ibid. XI. 20; cf. L. Sarup's Tr. p. 175.
8. BD. II.62; cf. also ṚV. VII.41. 2-5.
9. ibid. II. 130-31.
10. ibid. 156
11. ibid. III. 128.
12. ibid. IV.98-99.
13. BD. IV.117-20.
14. RV. III.53.21-24.

to Kaśyapa. From them the Gods and Asuras, Gandharvas, the Serpents, the Rākṣasas, Birds, Piśācas, and other classes (of beings) were produced. Now among these (daughters) the one goddess Aditi produced twelve sons. (These were) Bhaga, Aryaman and Aṃśa, Mitra and Varuṇa, Dhātṛ and Vidhātṛ, and Vivasvat of great brilliance, Tvaṣṭṛ, Pūṣan, and also Indra, the twelfth is called Viṣṇu. (Thus) that pair was born of her-Mitra and Varuṇa. Of these two Ādityas, when they saw the nymph Ūrvaśī at a sacrificial session, the semen was effused. It fell into jar containing water that stood overnight. Now the semen having fallen in various ways-in a jar, in water, on the ground – the sage Vasiṣṭha, best of seers, was produced on the ground, while Agastya was produced in the jar (and) Matsya, of great brilliance, in the water. Then Agastya, of great glory, arose being of the length of a peg (*śaṃyā*). Because he was meted with a measure, he is here called Mānya; or else (because) the seer was born from a jar. For measurement is made with a jar also: by 'jar' *(Kumbha)* the designation of a measure of capacity (*parimāṇa*) is indicated. Then, as the waters were being taken up *(gṛhyamāṇa)* Vasiṣtha was (found) standing on a lotus *(puṣkara)*. There on every side All-gods supported the lotus. Arising out of that water, he (Vasiṣṭha) then performed great austerity.

"His name arose with reference to his qualities *(guṇataḥ)*, from the root '*vas*' expressive of pre-emince: for he once upon a time, by means of austerity, saw Indra who was invisible to (other) seers. The Lord of Bay Steeds (Indra) then proclaimed to him (that he should receive) shares in *Soma*. For this appears from the *Brāhmaṇa* (passage) 'The seers (saw not) Indra (*ṛṣayo vā indram*). Vasiṣṭha and the Vasiṣṭhas thus (became) *Brāhmaṇas* in the office of Brahma priest, most worthy of fees in all rites at sacrifices. Therefore one should honour with fees all such descendants of Vasiṣṭha who may at any time even to-day be present at a sacrificial assembly, so (says) a sacred text of the Bhāllavins."[15]

It becomes clear from the above passage that the sage Vasiṣṭha was of divine origin and was favourite of Indra. He and his descendants got universal recognition as Brahman priests. The above passage can be said to be an amplification of the Ṛgvedic version of the story of Vasiṣṭha's birth.[16]

BD refers to Vasiṣṭha's bereavement in the death of his sons. It is as follows: The seer, when his hundred sons had been slain, by the followers of Sudāsa, full of pain and overwhelmed with grief for his sons, saw this hymn (RV.VIII.104), for the destruction of demons.... Vasiṣṭha was at that time pained, as his hundred sons had been slain by Sudāsa

15. BD V.143-59; also Macdonell's Tr., HOS, vol. 5, pp. 202–6.
16. RV. VII. 33-9-14.

who, in consequence of a curse, had been transformed into a demon *(rākṣasa);* such is the sacred tradition.[17]

This tale is related in the *Ṛgveda-sarvānukramaṇī* (Sarvā),[18] the *Vedārthadipikā* (VD), the *Mahābhārata (*MBh) and the *Purāṇas* also with certain changes. In connection with the above two stanzas of BD, Hariyappa[19] has pointed out that according to stanza 28, Vasiṣṭha's sons were killed by the Saudāsas, i.e. the followers of Sudāsa, and stanza 34 points out that they were killed by Sudāsa transformed into a demon. He says that it is a complicated situation and becomes further complicated in the Epics and the *Purāṇas.* But about these two stanzas it can be said that even though the actual killers were the servants of Sudāsa, yet his name is in no way connected or be connected with stanza 34. Nor can it be reasonably argued that he himself killed those sons. Certainly, a king's servents perform the duty and the credit goes to the master. So, there is nothing wrong in this stanza if it is mentioned here that Sudāsa killed those hundred sons of Vasiṣṭha.

At another place it is mentioned that Vyaṃsa became the king of Videha by the curse of Vasiṣṭha and by the favour of Indra he sacrificed holding sessions on the Sarasvatī.[20]

Attention should now be turned to Sarvā of Kātyāyana and the commentary on it by Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, which is known as VD. While introducing the Agastya-hymns, commencing with RV 1.166, Sarvā mentions the birth of Agastya and Vasiṣṭha from Mitrā-Varuṇā and Ūrvaśī.[21] VD has amplified it, in more or less the same manner as has been seen above.

Sarvā and VD do not contribute anything new to the stanzas styled as *Vasiṣṭha-dveṣiṇyaḥ.*[22] VD only reflects the information already given by BD and repeats one of the verses - *śatadhā bhidyate mūrdhā,* etc.[23] While introducing the *Sasarparī* verses (RV.III.53. 15, 16), VD relates a tale of Śakti, son of Vasiṣṭha, who overpowered Viśvāmitra and made him unconscious through the use of some charm in the sacrifice performed by Sudāsa, and now Jamadagni brought the *Sasarparī* and dispelled with it the charm used by Śakti.[24]

---

17. BD. VI. 28,34; also Macdonell's Tr.
18. *Ṛgveda-sarvānukramaṇī* of Kātyāyana with the commentary VD of Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, ed. by A.A. Macdonell, Oxford, 1886.
19. Hariappa. H.L.: *Ṛgvedic Legends Through the Ages.* p. 282. Deccan College, Poona, 1953.
20. BD. VII. 59.
21. Sarvā. pp. 12, 98.
22. ibid. pp. 16, 107.
23. BD. IV. 120
24. Sarvā. p. 107.

Sarvā and VD relate in detail the story of Vasiṣṭha's son Sakti being consigned to the fire by the servants of Sudāsa, instigated by Viśvāmitra.[25] Śakti went to the forest to bring flowers, etc. There, the servants of Sudāsa, instigated by Viśvāmitra, caught hold of him and thrust him into fire. At the time of this tragedy, he saw two *ṛks* starting with-*Indrakratuṁ na......* (RV. 32.26-27). Hardly he could utter only first-half of the first *ṛk*, when he was consigned to the flames. Later Vasiṣṭha came and in the fit of grief he completed the verse by reciting second line-*śikṣā ṇo'smin*, etc.

The above mentioned two passages clearly hint at the deadly form taken by the historical feud between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra.

Vasiṣṭha and his sons, i.e. Indrapramati, Vṛṣagaṇa, Manyu, Upamanyu, Vyāghrapād, Śakti, Karṇaśrut, Mṛḷikā, Vasukra and Parāśara (grandson), are credited with the seership of the parts of RV. IX.97.[26]

Dyā Dviveda, in his *Nītimañjarī* (NM) refers to Vasiṣṭha in connection with certain moralisations propounded by him in this text. It is said that sons' misdeeds do not grieve the heart of the father. Vasiṣṭha praised his sons even after they put an end to Pāśadyumna's sacrifice.[27] It happened like this: When the sons of Vasiṣṭha officiated the sacrifice for Sudāsa, then Pāśadyunma desired to perform Soma-sacrifice. Indra was present in the later's sacrifice and was about to drink Soma-juice which was being pressed. Vasiṣṭha's sons made Indra leave Pāśadyumna's sacsifice by the power of their *mantra* and became successful to bring him in Sudāsa's sacrifice.

In the next stanza[28] it is propounded that the knower of Law should not behave strictly in accordance with laws especially when his family is in trouble. Vasiṣṭha, when he went to Varuṇa's house for theft, caused all his people to sleep. The author comments that even luxuries may be provided, by stealing, to a distressed family. Here, Dviveda forgets that Vasiṣṭha was just experiencing a dream and he had not gone there to steal. According to Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, he entered Varuṇa's house afflicted with hunger.

A man becomes great only by his virtues, not due to possession of wealth. Distressed Vasiṣṭha got wealth by praising frogs. But the frogs remained among the lower species because they did not have good qualities. But Vasiṣṭha was great due to his virtue.[29]

---

25. ibid. pp. 25, 130-31.
26. ibid. p. 35.
27. NM. 105.
28. ibid. 105.
29. ibid. 108.

As one can very clearly see that these strange moralisations of Dyā Dviveda do not contribute anything new to our study, this discussion should be closed simply referring to other instances where Vasiṣṭha is involved.[30]

In short, the references about Vasiṣṭha in these ancillary texts do not in any way add much material about his life, doings, etc. It can, therefore, be concluded that Vasiṣṭha is depicted in these texts as a reputed personality with a divine birth. There are clear references to his enmity with Viśvāmitra. Only Nir does not refer to it. BD and Sarvā with its commentary VD amply illustrate this feud. The stories regarding this feud are related in an epic style and give colur to this animosity as is very clear from the references. NM does not contribute anything special about Vasiṣṭha. Due to strangeness and incredibility of its moralisations, significant material could not be gleaned from this text.*

30. ibid. 106, 109, 110.

* I am grateful to Dr. V.G. Rahurkar, C.A.S.S., University of Poona, for going through the paper carefully and making useful suggestions.

Dr. M. S. NARAYANA MURTI

BHAṬṬOJI DĪKṢITA AND KOṆḌUBHAṬṬA ON THE PRIMARY DENOTATION

While Patañjali and Bhartṛhari are the poineers of the Philosophy of Grammar, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his nephew Koṇḍubhaṭṭa are the innovators of many new concepts in the wake of the renaissance of the linguistic speculations. The science of Grammar is evolved by borrowing such concepts prevelent in dfferent schools which could be substantiated logically without being biased by any unilaterally postulated presuppositions. For example the influence of the pre-Advaitic concepts and some Sāṃkhyan thoughts are incorporated in the main content of Bhartṛhari's theory of Verbal Monism (Śabdādvaita), while many other concepts like the idea of quality or number are borrowed from that of the Nyāya-vaiśeṣika. But it was in later periods the science of grammar has been detached from other schools of Philosophy. Eventhough the similarities in the concepts in general could be located, there are always differences at the bottom on the basic presumptions. And at the same time the religious and philosophical affiliations to one among the schools of Vedānta had a very high degree of influence on the philosophy of Grammar. Of the works available at our disposal dealing with the minute differences between the grammarians and other schools Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Śabdakaustubha* and *Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana* and Koṇḍubhaṭṭa's *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* which is in the form of a commentary on the *Vaiyākaraṇa-matonmajjana* are of very great value. The present paper is aimed at to bring out their observations on the primary denotation by drawing parallels from other systems of philosophy.

I. MĪMĀṂSĀ VIEW

According to the Mīmāṃsā the relation between the word and its meaning (*vācya-vācaka-bhāva*) is the potentiality (*śakti*) of the word and

that potentiality is eternal (*autpattika*) and natural (*svābhāvika*) [1] This potentiality is a separate ontological category. The knowledge of the relation existing between the word and its meaning is the *sahakāri-kāraṇa* for the comprehension of the referent by a word; for, without such a knowledge one cannot understand the meaning of a word.[2] The words have a twofold function (*vyāpāra*) in language, namely primary denotation (*abhidhā* or *mukhya*) and secondary denotation (*lakṣaṇā* or *gauṇa*)

II. NAIYĀYIKA VIEW

The Naiyāyika agrees with the Mīmāṃsaka that the relation is the potentiality[3] and that the knowlege of the relation is essential before on could comprehend the referent of a word when used in a sentence;[4] but differs from him as to the nature of the relation. He holds it conventional (*saṅketa*). He does not also admit the potentiality as a separate category. He makes Īśvara as the *saṅketayitā* or creator of convention. He also admits *lakṣaṇā* as a distinct function in language stemming from the incompatibility of the primary sense.[5] The words which have no sanction of the convention of Īśvara like the Apabhraṃśa words are treated as corrupt (*asādhu*).[6] Grammar is the touchstone in determining the correct and corrupt words.[7] The Apabhraṃśa words do not have any intrinsic denotative function.

III. JAYATĪRTHA'S VIEW

Koṇḍubhaṭṭa refers to the Mādhva exponent Jayatīrtha who combines both the ideas of the Mīmāṃsaka and Naiyāyika, and holds that the relation of the word with its meaning is both natural (*svābhāvika*) and conventional (*sāṅketika*). In case of the correct words the conventional potentiality is the auxiliary instrument (*sahakāri*) to the natural poten-

---

1. *autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandaḥ*, JS. 1.1.5.
   See also :
   ....*vācya vācakabhāva eva sambandhaḥ śaktirūpaḥ śabdārthayor anivāryaḥ sambhavati*........, *Prabhā* of Vaidyanāthaśāstri on JS. 1.1.5, p.44 Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvali, 97, 1929.
2. *yathā śabdasyārthapratyāyakatvaṃ lokavyavahārāt pratīyate tathaiva śaktivijñānam api pratyāyakasya śabdasya sahakāribhūtam iti lokavyavahārād evāvagamate, na hi sahakāriṇaṃ vinā karaṇatvaṃ kasyacid api kutrāpi dṛśyate.* *Prabhā, ibid. p. 44.*
3. *śaktiś ca padena saha padārthasya sambandhaḥ, Muktāvali* under the *kārikā* 81.
4. *padajñānaṃ tu karaṇaṃ dvāraṃ tatra padārthadhīḥ* / *śābdabodhaḥ phalaṃ tatra śaktidhīḥ sahakāriṇī* // ibid. *karikā* 81.
5. *lakṣaṇā ca vṛttyantaram. yatra vācyārthānvayānupapatyā vācyasambandhopasthāpite vākyārthānvayaḥ, Tattvacintāmaṇi (TC), part IV - vol. II, p. 660. Bibliotheca Indica, Calcuttā, 1901.*
6. *yaḥ śabdo yatreśvareṇa saṅketitaḥ sa tatra sādhur ity ucyate, ibid. p. 648.*
7. *vyākaraṇavyutpādyatvaṃ sādhutvaṃ yaḥ śabdo yasmin arthe vyākaraṇam utpāditaḥ sa tatra sādhuḥ*, ibid. pp. 652–3.

tiality while in the case of corrupt words or the words of Apabhraṃśa there is only conventional potentiality. He establishes the relation being natural by quoting JS. 1.1.5 : *autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandhaḥ.*[8] He incorporates the convention as an auxiliary instrument in analogy to the perception where the senses, although possessing the natural power to comprehend their respective objects, need contact with them to have the perception.[9] He postulates the convention as the relation to account for the comprehension of two different referents by two different persons. For example the word *yava* is comprehended as *dīrghaśūka* and *priyaṅgu* by the Āryas and Mlechhas repectively.[10] When the *śakti* is natural such a denotation could not be substantiated.

Jayatīrtha holds that the Naiyāyika concept of *śakti* is untenable. Firstly, he says that bringing in Īśvara as the creator of convention does not stand to logic because the human conventions have also gained currency in usage. Secondly, if convention alone were to be the determinant of the relation of the word with its referent, there would be a contingency that no value of merit (*Dharma*) could be attached to the correct usage of language. For, according to the convention theory the function of language is confined only to point out the conventional object and the question of the words being correct or corrupt does not arise at all. Hence *Vyākaraṇa* becomes useless.[11] Thirdly, it is not necessary to bring in Īśvara as the creator of convention when we also could draw conventions through usage. As to the newly coined words, Jayatīrtha remarks that while the Naiyāyika maintains that *Īśvara-saṅketa* is *jñāpita* the Naturalist holds that the natural potentiality lying dormant is revealed by those words.[12]

REFUTATION OF MĀDHVA VIEW

The Naiyāyika dismisses the arguments of Jayatīrtha as illogical on the following grounds: 1. The definition of the relation offered by the Mādhvas has the defect of non-pervasion because the convention in some places and natural potentiality in some other places is responsible for the comprehension of the referent, and neither of them could exclu-

8. *svābhāvikenaiva sambandhenety arthaḥ. taduktam jaimininā 'autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandha' iti, (Bṛhad) Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa (VB), p. 239.*
9. *nanu sati svābhāvike sambandhe vyutpannavad avyutpannasyāpi. bodhaḥ syāt. ......atra svābhāvike 'rthapratyāyakatve saty api yathendriyasannikarṣāpekṣā tathātrāpi saṅketagrahasacivasyaiva bodhakam ity āha - pratyakṣavacceti,* ibid. p. 240
10. *āryā hi yavaśabdaṃ dīrghaśūke prayuñjate, dīrghaśūkam eva ca budhyante. mlecchās tu priyaṅgau prayuñjate, priyaṅguṃ ca buddyante......kiṃ tu kvacit svābhāvikayā śaktyā bodhaḥ kvacit saṅketād ity aniyamaḥ,* ibid.
11. *dvitīye, padārthopasthitimātrasya prayojanatvāt sādhvasādhuvibhāgārthakaṃ vyākaraṇādi vyartham iti,* ibid.
12. *idānīmtanasaṅketeneśvarasaṅketo jñāpyata iti cet, tarhy asman mate 'pi svābhāvikaḥ sambandho jñāpyata iti tulyam,* ibid.

sively constitute the relation existing between the word and its referent.[13] Therefore for the comprehension of the referent by a word the knowledge of convention alone is the instrument. The *Īśvara-saṅketa* is the general cause of convention. Our coining of new words itself does not constitute the convention because of our capacity being very much limited.[14] 2. As regards the role of Īśvara, even the Naturalist has to accept an agent who could communicate conventions at the beginning of creation. When the agent himself, say Īśvara, could be maintained as omnipotent to innovate convention between the word and its meaning there is no reason to admit another potentiality beyond *Īśvara-saṅketa.*[15] 3. The correctness of words depends upon the *Īśvara-saṅketa.* Hence the grammar and dictionaries are useful to determine the *sādhutva,* i.e. whether the sense obtained by a word is actually intended by Īśvara or not.[16]

IV. GRAMMARIAN'S VIEW

The grammarian takes a liberal out look towards the positions of the Mīmāṃsaka and Naiyāyika. The transparent contribution of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Koṇḍubhaṭṭa lies in their attempt to strike a line of compromise between the Naiyāyika and Mīmāṃsaka. The salient features of their theory on primary denotation may be epitomized as follows:

A. The potentiality of the word is its capacity to produce the cognition *(bodhajanakatvam)* of a referent.

B. The secondary denotation does not constitute another function of language apart from primary denotation.

C. The Apabhraṃśa words also are endowed with potentiality.

A. Bodhakatvam is Śakti

It has been already mentioned that according to both the Naiyāyika and Mīmāṃsaka the prior knowledge of the capacity of a word to denote a particular referent is essential and is the *sahakāri-kāraṇa.* The grammarian holds that this capacity to produce the cognition of a referent *(bodhajanakatvam)* itself could be taken as the potentiality of the word.[17] While Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita supports his stand by quoting the

13. *kvacit saṅketasya kvacic chakter jñānaṃ kāraṇam iti vyabhicārād ekasyāpi ta tathā na syāt,* ibid. p. 241.
14. *asmākam punaḥ saṅketatvarūpeṇaiva taj jñānaṃ hetuḥ. tac ceśvarasaṅketa-sādhāraṇam. na cāsmadādīnām eva sa tathāstu,* ibid.
15. *sṛṣṭyādi vyavahāre tvayāpi tasya śaktigrāhakatvenābhyupetavyatvāt. ubhaya-siddheśvarecchāṃ tyaktvātiriktakalpane gauravāc ca,* ibid.
16. *tādṛśeśvarasaṅketitatvaṃ ca sādhutvam. tatparicchedakaṃ ca vyākaraṇakośādi-kam iti na tadvaiyarthyam,* ibid.
17. *arthadhījanakatvam eva padasya śaktiḥ,* ibid.

kārikā from the *Vākyapadiya*,[18] Koṇḍubhaṭṭa corroborates with the Advaitic statement from *Vivaraṇa*.[19] Bhartṛhari maintains that just as the competency of the sense-organs of eye, etc., is eternal (*anādi*) to comprehend their sense objects like pot, the competency of the words to denote their referents, named *bodhakāraṇatā* is eternal.[20] This *bodhakāraṇatā* is the potentiality. Like the Mīmāṃsaka, Koṇḍubhaṭṭa holds that this potentiality is a separate ontological category.[21]

Koṇḍubhaṭṭa holds that convention in any form could not be maintained as the potentiality of the word. The knowlege of *sāṅketa* cannot be the cause (*hetu*) for the denotation of the referent, because if it were to be so, the convention will also be presented in the cognition along with the referent. But for the Mīmāṃsaka or another who does not admit the convention, there is no comprehension of the convention as the *hetu* in the cognition of the referent. Thus it results in the definition being defective because of non-pervasion.[22] Secondly even the existence in itself (*svarūpasatī*) of *saṅketa* could not be the cause for the denotation because in that case the meaning could be understood even of a word whose relation with its meaning is not comprehended.[23] For example the *saṅketa* has to be admitted for the Apabhraṃśa words; for, they are found denotative of some referents. The Naiyāyika, unlike the grammarian, does not admit the Apabhraṃśa words as having *saṅketa*. He holds that the denotation of a referent by the Apabhraṃśa word may be justified either by treating the comprehension of the referent as an illusion or through the correct form recollected on hearing the corrupt form. But this contention is not correct; for, the denotation by the Apabhraṃśa word could not be an illusion as it is not subsequently sublated by a valid cognition which is the criterian for holding a knowledge illusory.[24] Thirdly the *saṅketa* could not be the cause even in the form of *Īśvara-saṅketa* because every body knows the meaning of the word even with out the knowledge of *Īśvara-saṅketa*. Fourthly *saṅketa* cannot be the

---

18. *ata eva kāraṇatvaṃ śaktiḥ iti siddhāntaṃ sphuṭīkartum evendriyāṇām iti vākyapadīyakārikām udājahāra granthakāraḥ*, ibid. p. 243.
19. *tathā smaraṇābhimānapramohakhaṇḍane vivaraṇe'py uktam. bodhajananasāmarthyam eva śabdasyārthena sambandha iti*, ibid.
20. *indriyāṇaṃ svaviṣayeṣvanādir yogyatā yathā* |
anādir arthaiḥ śabdānāṃ sambandho yogyatā tathā || ibid. p. 238.
See also :
indriyāṇāṃ cakṣurādīnāṃ svaviṣayeṣu cākṣuṣapratyakṣādiṣu yathānādir yogyatā, bodhakāraṇatā tathā śabdānām api saiva yogyatā ity arthaḥ, ibid. p. 238.
21. *iyaṃ ca padārthāntaram*, ibid.
22. *īśvarādeḥ saṅketam ajñātvāpi mīmāṃsakādīnām arthapratyayena tadbhānakāraṇatāyāṃ vyabhicārāt*, ibid. p. 241.
23. *svarūpasann eva sa hetur iti cen na. agṛhītaśaktikād api bodhāpatteḥ*, ibid.
24. *apabhraṃśād api boddhena vyabhicārāc ca. na ca śaktibhramāt sādhuśabdasmaraṇād vā tatra bodhaḥ. anupadam eva khaṇḍayiṣyamāṇatvāt*, ibid. p. 241.

kāraṇa even as 'the relation being determined by the capacity of producing the cognition of a referent (*arthajanakatvāvacchedakena*)', because it results in prolixity (*gaurava*).[25] While *arthajanakatva* itself is suffice to account for the denotation of a referent by a word, it is superflous to presume another concept of convention. Therefore the potentiality of the word is its capacity to produce the knowledge of the referent.[26]

B. Lakṣaṇā is not distinct from Śakti

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita holds that both the primary sense and secondary sense stem from the same potentiality (*śakti*) and the distinction between the primary sense and secondary sense could be explained by examining relative frequency of usage or *prasiddhi*.[27] While the Mīmāṃsakas and Naiyāyikas explain the signification of the sense of bank by the word gaṅgā in the expression *gaṅgāyāṃ ghoṣaḥ* through *lakṣaṇā* resulting from the incompatibility of the primary sense, Koṇḍubhaṭṭa holds that the word *gaṅgā* itself has the capacity to denote the bank also.[28] But as the denotation of the bank by the word *gaṅgā* is not *prasiddhā* as its another sense 'current,' the sense of 'bank' can not be comprehended by the listener with out the knowledge of the speaker's intention (*tātparya*).[29] The nonintelligibility of syntactic relation (*anvayānupapatti*) is useful for knowing the intention of the speaker. This nonintelligibility of syntactic relation arises because of taking the word in its *prasiddhārtha*.[30] Hence it has been upheld by the grammarians that when the intention of the speaker could be communicated to the listener, any word can denote any referent. This theory has been formulated on the basis of the grammatical canon *sarve sarvārthāḥ*, i.e. 'every word is denotative of every referent'.[31] But due to convention prevailing upon the usage the words are used only in some senses. This theory has indeed been well illustrated by Bhartṛhari in the *kārikās* :

---

25. *taddhījanakatāvacchedakatvena jñānasyārthapratītihetutve gauravāt*, ibid. p. 242.
26. *tasmād bodhakatvam eva śaktiḥ. tac ca bodhajanakatvam indriyādivat*, ibid. p. 243.
27. *pracuratarapraуogatadvirahābhyāṃ gauṇamukhyavibhāga iti gṛhāṇa*, *Śabdakaustubha*, vol. 1, p. 25. chowkhamba sanskrit series, 1929.
    See also :
    gauṇamukhya vibhāgo 'pi prasiddhyaprasiddhinibandhana eva, ibid. p. 69.
28. *gaṅgāpadāt tīropasthitau tatra tadbodhakatvasyāvaśyakalpyatvāt. kiṃ ca gaṅgāpadaṃ tīre śaktam iti jñāne sati vinā lakṣaṇājñānaṃ tataḥ tīropasthitiḥ sarvasiddā*, ibid. p. 246.
29. *asman mate gaṅgāpadāt tīraṃ boddhavyam iti vaktus tātparyajñāne eva gaṅgāpade tīrabodhakatvasya grahāt tasyaiva coktarītyā śaktitvāt samānaviṣayakaśaktijñānasyāvabodhanādoṣāt*, ibid. p. 245.
30. *anvayānupapattes tātparyajñāne evopayogaḥ*, ibid. p. 247
31. *ata eva prāyaḥ sarve sarvārthā iti siddhāntapravādaḥ padena sati tātparye prāyaḥ sarveśām bodhanāt*, ibid. p. 243.

ekam āhur anekārthaṃ śabdam anye parīkṣakāḥ /
nimittabhedāt sarvatra sārvārthyaṃ tasya bhidyate //
yaugapadyam atikramya paryāyeṣv avatiṣṭhate /
arthaprakaraṇābhyāṃ vā yogāc chabdāntareṇa vā //
yathā sāsnādimān piṇḍo gośabdenābhidhīyate
tathā sa eva gośabdo vāhīke 'pi vyavasthitaḥ /
sarvaśaktes tu tasyaiva śabdasyānekadharmiṇaḥ
prasiddhatyāgād gauṇatvam mukhyatvaṃ vopajāyate //[32]

An objection is raised by the Lakṣaṇāvādin that in case the secondary denotation is not admitted, it would produce doubt as to the meaning of the homonyms like *akṣa* and *pāda* because every word is denotative of any sense.[33]

The objection is dismissed by Koṇḍubhaṭṭa saying that it has no firm ground. There is no room for doubt to a man who is not conscious of all the meanings. So the doubt arises only to a man who is aware of all the meanings.[34] This indetermination of meaning is welcomed by the grammarian because the nonintelligibility of syntactic relation (*anvayānupapatti*) results in only by taking the word in any other sense than that is intended by the speaker. As mentioned already the *anvayānupapatti* helps in determining *tātparya* through which one could easily locate the sense in which the word has to be taken in a given context.

Koṇḍubhaṭṭa denounces the Naiyāyika or Mīmāṃsaka concept of *lakṣaṇā* as a distinct function from *abhidhā* on the following grounds: 1. The usage *(vyavahāra)* from which the potentiality or the words is comprehended is common to both the primary and secondary denotations.[35] 2. Admittance of *lakṣaṇā* results, in the prolixity; for, two relations of cause and effect-one for *śakti* and the other for *Lakṣaṇā* - should be shown. On the other hand there is logical economy in the theory of the grammarian due to the admittance of only one relation.[36] 3. The definition of *lakṣaṇā* becomes nonpervasive because the cognition of the referent in some instances arises by mere knowledge produced by the secondary denotation with out the comprehension of the primary denotation.[37] As the *lakṣaṇā* is defined as *śakyasambandhaḥ*, i. e. the relation

---

32. ibid. p. 248.
33. *nanu lakṣaṇayā akalpane sarveṣām padānāṃ nānārthatvād akṣādipadavad arthasandehaḥ syāt,* ibid. p. 246.
34. *yasya nānārthatvajñānaṃ nāsti na tasya saḥ, aprasya saṃśaya iṣṭa eva,* ibid.
35. *śaktigrāhakasya vyavahārasya mukhyalākṣaṇikasādhāraṇatvāt,* ibid. p. 243.
36. *anyathā pratyakṣādi janyopasthiteḥ śābdabodhānaṅgatvāc chābdabodhaṃ prati śaktijanyopasthiter lakṣaṇājanyopasthiteś ca kāraṇatvaṃ vācyam. tathā ca kāryakāraṇabhāvadvayakalpane gauravaṃ syāt,* ibid.
37. *api ca lakṣaṇāvṛttisvīkāre kāryakāraṇabhāvasya pratyekaṃ vyabhicāraḥ śaktijanyopasthitiṃ vināpi lakṣaṇājanyopasthititaḥ śābdabodhāt,* ibid.

between the actual referent intended and the referent denoted by the word, the secondary denotation should normally follow the primary denotation. 4. It also results in deviation from the causality (*vyabhicāra*), for the cause of cognition will be in this case some times the knowledge of *śakti* and some times that of *lakṣaṇā*.

C. Apabhraṃśa words as having Potentiality

The observations of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Koṇḍubhaṭṭa on the Apabhraṃśa words are based on the *Vākyapadīya*. As defined by Bhartṛhari, the Apabhraṃśa words are those which do not follow the grammatical rules, like *gāvi* and used in the sense of a specified referent whose grammatically justified form is *gauḥ* [38] The correctness of words varies in conformity with the motif (*pravṛtti-nimitta*) behind the usage of words. So the words *asva* and *goṇī* are correct when used in the sense of 'possessor of no wealth' (i. e. nonpossessor of wealth) and the 'bag made out of jute', while they are corrupt when used in the sense of *aśva* and *go* respectively.[39] Bhartṛhari refers to two different views as to the nature of the communication of the referent, one attributed to the non-grammarians like the Naiyāyikas (VP. I.150–153) and the other to the grammarians (VP.I. 154–155)

The Naiyāyikas hold that the correctness or corruptness of words depends upon the possession of the denotativeness. It is held that the potentiality or denotativeness lies only in Sanskrit words on the ground that this language is uniformly the same all through the country.[40] On the other hand the Apabhraṃśas like Mahārāṣṭra do not have potentality because the same language is different in different localities and is confined to a limited area.[41] But the Naiyāyikas have to account for as to how the meanings are communicated by the Apabhraṃśa words as it is nothing but truism that they are communicative of some referent. They hold that the learned people comprehend the referent of the Apabhraṃśa words on remembering the corresponding Sanskrit equivalents.[42] So the Apabhraṃśa word functions as reminder to the corresponding Sanskrit cognate. The illiterate on the other hand, as the Naiyāyika holds, comprehends the referent due to the illusion that the Apabhraṃśa word has the potentiality.[43]

---

38. *śabdaḥ saṃskārahīno yo gaur iti prayukṣite /*
tam apabhraṃśam icchanti viśiṣṭārthaniveśinam // VP. I. 148.

39. *asvagoṇyādayaḥ śabdāḥ sādhavo viṣayāntare ,*
nimittabhedāt sarvatra sādhutvaṃ ca vyavasthitam // ibid. 149.

40. *atra ca saṃskṛtasya sarvadeśe ekatvāt tatraiva śaktiḥ*, VB. p. 248.

41. *bhāṣaṇāṃ ca pratideśaṃ bhinnatvāt saṃskṛtaiḥ saha paryāyatāpatteś ca na śaktiḥ* ibid.

42. *asādhur anumānena vācakaḥ kaiścid iṣyate /* ibid.
See also :
vyutpannasya sādhuśabdasmaraṇād bodhopapatteḥ, ibid. Kā. 38.

43. *avyutpannasya śaktibhramād bodhaḥ*, ibid. p. 249.

Here one may question as to how an illiterate can have an illusion when he has no knowldege of the Sanskrit cognate. The Naiyāyika says that an illiterate takes the Apabhraṃśa word as possessing denotativeness by illusion when he hears it used by a literate who could consciously use the Apabhraṃśa word in lieu of its Sanskrit equivalent.[44] This view is represented by the traditional Naiyāyikas.

Koṇḍubhaṭṭa refers to the Navīnas or Moderns in the Nyāya school who uphold that the touchstone for the correctness or corruptness of words is not the possession of denotativeness, because the words are considered to be correct even without the knowledge of the convention (of Īśvara).[45] But the words are termed correct on the basis of their derivation by grammar. So any form which could grammatically be accounted for is correct and the other corrupt.[46]. These people advocate that the nomenclatures of individuals like *dittha* are also derivable on the basis of the rule *uṇādayo bahulam*.[47] Similarly the prior knowledge of the correct words also could not be instrumental to the comprehension of the referent, because one who is conscious of the grammatical constituents of the words can understand the referent even when a word is heard for the first time.[48] But the definite knowledge of the corruptness of the word is an obstruction for the comprehension of the referent. So the words like *gāvī* are not denotative because the hearer definitely knows that they are corrupt. In such cases, as mentioned above, either the recollection of the correct form or the illusion of the word as grammatically correct causes the knowledge of the referent of the Apabhraṃśa words.[49]

The grammarian differs from the Naiyāyika and maintains that the Apabhraṃśa words also possess denotativeness.[50] Bhartṛhari makes it clear that the Apabhraṃśa words are not to be treated as different from Sanskrit. But it is because of the defect in the articulation of speech sounds due to the loss of teeth, etc., in the speakers, the words are spelt with altered sounds. And these speech sounds being passed on

44. *na ca pāmarāṇāṃ śaktyagrahe kathaṃ tadbhramaḥ. pūrvapūrvabhramād uttarottarabhramopapatteḥ. prathamatas tu vyutpanno 'pabhraṃśāt sādhuśabdam buddhvā vyavahṛtavān. tanmūlakaḥ śaktibhramo 'nyeṣām*, ibid.

45. *vastuto vṛttimattvaṃ na sādhutvam. saṅketatvādy ajñāne 'pi sādhutvavyavahārāt*, ibid.

46. *tasmān na saṅketitatvaghaṭitam. kiṃ tu vyākaraṇaniṣpādyatvam*, ibid.

47. *yatra yaḥ śabda vyākaraṇe vyutpāditaḥ sa tatra sādhuḥ. ḍitthādināmnām apy uṇādayo bahulam ity anena vyutpādanasambhavān nānupapannam.* ibid.

48. *evaṃ sādhutvajñānaṃ karaṇam ity apy ayuktam. avayavādivyutpnnena pūrvaprayogam ajñātvāpi navakādiprayogāt*, ibid.

49. *kiṃ tv asādhutvaniścayaḥ pratibandhakaḥ..... evaṃ ca gāvyāder asādhutvajñānarupapratibandhakasattvān na bodhakatvam iti sādhusmaraṇāc chaktibhramād vā tad vācyam iti tu navīnāḥ*, ibid.

50. *vācakatvāviśeṣe vā niyamaḥ puṇyapāpayoḥ*, ibid. *Kā.* 38. p. 248.

to the ladies and uneducated gain frequency because of easy pronunciation. Hence these words also are denotative of their referents. So When a Sanskrit word is used its referent is comprehended by an illiterate only after the recollection of the corresponding Apabhraṃśa form.[51] The Sanskrit language has become corrupt because of the incapability of the speakers of the language. Hence the question of the correctness and corruptness of words is distinguishable only in the school of conventionalists.[52]

The grammarian differs from the Naiyāyika on the following grounds. Firstly, the statement that the comprehension of the referent of the Apabhraṃśa word on the recollection of the corresponding Sanskrit cognate could not be substantiated because there should not be any comprehension of the referent to a person not knowing the equivalents.[53] Secondly. the comprehension of the referent could not also be by illusion because the cognition of the referent is not sublated by any other cogniton.[54] Thirdly, as we do not find any *vinigamanatā*, the potnetiality has to be admitted in the Apabhraṃśa languages also. And it does not result in prolixity by admitting potentiality in Sanskrit as well as in its dialects because of two reasons, namely 1. that there is no other alternative and 2. that each dialect is uniformly the same in each place.[55] Lastly, the determinant of potentiality is neither adherence to the grammatical rules of Sanskrit nor being a dialect. But the potentiality behind Sanskrit and its Apabhraṃśa can be different as for the Sanskrit synonyms *ghaṭa* and *kalaśa*. The synonyms *ghaṭa* and *kalaśa* possess two different potentialities and the admittance of potentiality in one word does not take away the potentiality in the other.[56]

Koṇḍubhaṭṭa does not accept the knowledge of the corruptness of words as an obstacle to the comprehension of the referent as maintained by the later Naiyāyikas; for, even being aware of the corrup·ness of words, one who does not know Sanskrit can comprehend the referents by the Prakrit words.[57]

---

51. *pāramparyād apabhraṃśā viguṇesv abhidhātṛṣu |*
prasiddhim āgatā yena teṣāṃ sādhur avācakaḥ || VP. I. 154.

52. *daivī vāg vyavakīrṇeyam aśaktair abhidhātṛbhiḥ |*
anityadarśināṃ tv asmin vāde buddhiviparyaye || ibid. 155.

53. *na ca sādhusmaraṇād bodhaḥ, tam aviduṣāṃ jāyamānatvāt,* ibid. p. 250.

54. *nāpi śaktibhramāt tato bodhakatvasyābādhena taj jñānasyābhramatvāt,* ibid.

55. *vinigamanāvirahād bhāṣāyām api śaktiḥ. na coktaṃ gauravaṃ saṃskṛtavan mahārāṣṭrabhāṣāyāṃ śakter duṣparihāratvāt. tasyāḥ sarvadeśe evaikatvāt,* ibid.

56. *kiṃ ca na saṃskṛtatvaṃ na vā bhāṣātvaṃ śaktyavacchedakaṃ. kiṃ tv ānupūrvī sā ca bhinnabhinnaiva sarvatreti ghaṭakalaśādiparyāyeṣv iva naikenāparānyathāsiddhir iti bhāṣāyaṃ śaktir eva,* ibid.

57. *evaṃ nāsādhutvaniścayaḥ pratibandhakaḥ. tatsatve 'pi saṃskṛtam aviduṣāṃ prākṛtāder bodhāt.* ibid. p. 251.

Now it may be asked as to why there should be such injunctions like *sādhubhir bhāṣitavyam*, 'correct words should be used' and *nāpabhraṃśitavai na mlecchitavai*, 'Apabhraṃśa or Mleccha words should not be used' restricting the liberty of the speaker, when both Sanskrit and its Apabhraṃśa equally possess potentiality. The answer is that it would result in accruing the fruits of *puṇya* and *pāpa* by using the Sanskrit and its Apabhraṃśas respectively,[58] as is evident from the *vārttika* of Kātyāyana *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe lokato rthaprayuṅkte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharmaniyamo yathā laukikavaidikeṣu.*[59] The study of grammar is also essential for the differentiation of the correct and corrupt words in usage.

58. *'sādhubhir bhāṣitavyam', 'nāpabhraṃśitavai na mlecchitavai' ityādau puṇyapāpa jananāt sādhvasādhuvidhipratiṣedhaviṣayajñāpanam eva tajjñāpanaphalm iti bhāvaḥ*, ibid. p. 252.

59. Cf. MB.

Dr. T. KODANDARAMAIAH

THE TRADITION OF DEDICATION IN TELUGU

The tradition of dedication occurs more in Telugu than in any other Indian Language. Kings, chieftains, high dignitaries in the service of the kings deemed it an honour to have the works of the poets dedicated to them and took a pride also in having them so. The act of dedication is called *aṅkita* which meant 'branded or marked' in Sanskrit. It is derived of the word *aṅka* the meaning of which is 'a mark or a sign'[1]. The word *aṅkita* is Sanskrit means the same as the word 'dedication' in English, the meaning of which is given as inscribing a book to some one as a mark of appreciation or admiration. The act of dedicating a work to some is termed in Telugu as *aṅkitamu cēyu, aṅkitamu kāviñcu* and also *aṅkitamiccu.* One to whom the work is dedicated is called *kṛtipati* (recepient) and when he accepts the dedication it is known as *kṛtisvīkāramu* (receiving the poem) whereas *kṛtisamarpaṇamu* (giving away the Poem) is the act of dedicating the work to some one by the author.

The tradition seems to have been in vogue for quite a long time in Telugu. It is described in the classics that kings or chieftains as the case may be send for the poets whom they love much and in whose scholarship they have confidence and in the Royal court where the elite of the kingdom assembled request the poet to compose certain work and dedicate the same to him after elaborately describing the qualities of head and heart of the poet concerned. The poet agrees to comply with his request by receiving a *tāmbūlam,* a token for having agreed besides various presents given to him on the occasion. There are a few poets who voluntarily also dedicated their works out of reverence and regard towards their patrons and benefactors. The poets go home and start the composition with invocatory verses (*iṣṭadēvatā-prārthanamu*) invoking the blessings of the diety to the king in every verse. The description of the dynasty of the kings forms an important part of the Prologue (*avatā-*

1. a) *madgotrāṅkaṃ viracita padam* – Megha. 91,
   b) *rativalayapadāṅke......kaṇṭhe* – Kumāra. II. 64.

rikā) to the work. After that, there will be a few verses called *ṣaṣṭhyantamulu* in which all the adjectives used for the king and in possessive case and they will be mostly in the *kanda* metre. The story proper starts with the poet saying that he starts the work for the prosperity and progress of the king (*abhyudayaparamparābhivṛddhigā*). Having thus begun the story he tells it in compartments which are called *āśvāsas* He begins and ends the *āśvāsas* with verses addressing the king to whom the work is dedicated in various kinds of adjectives which describe at length his qualities and adventurous deeds. This is the type of the treatment that we almost find in the poems that were dedicated to some one or the other.

It will be interesting to note that there is no such tradition in Sanskrit. It is said that the *Pratāparudrīya*, a work on poetics, was dedicated to Pratāparudra II (13th century).[2] It is true that every example in verse is in praise of Pratāparudra and his name (*nāmamudra*) appears in every *śloka* given as example in the work. But we do not find in it the tradition as is found in Telugu works. One Rājanātha Ḍiṇḍima, a court-poet of the Vijayanagara king, Acyutadēvarāya wrote *Bhāgavata* in *Campū* in Sanskrit and dedicated it to his king, Acyutadēvarāya. As the poet happened to be an Āndhra he might have done so due to the influence of the tradition found in Telugu Literature. This tradition is there in Prākṛt and Kannaḍa[3] also. There, the poets dedicated their works to their kings and teachers. In Tamil also we find poems written under the patronage of kings and Malayaḷam poets do not seem to have this kind of tradition.

Nannecōḍa (12th century) emulated the example of Kannaḍa poets in this matter and dedicated his work *Kumārasambhava* to his *guru* Jaṅgama Mallikārjuna whom he considered and revered as his personal diety (*iṣṭadaiva*) and beloved king (*kūrcu nijēśuḍu*) as well. In this he has identified his *guru* with the hero of the poem, Lord Śiva himself. In his opinion the *kṛtipati*, the recepient of the work Jaṅgama Mallikārjuna and the *kṛtināyaka*, the hero of the poem, Lord Śiva are one and the same. He found no difference between them. Under the pretext of describing the qualities of the hero, he described the traits of the *kṛtipati*

2. P. V. Ramanujaswami, 'Āndhrulu - Saṃskṛtavāṅmayamu', *Bhārati - Silver Jubilee Number* (1949), p. 31.

3. In Kannaḍa the tradition is found in a different manner. The poet observes *abheda* and identifies the king or patron with the hero of the work. He attributes all the qualities of his benefactor and also his titles to the hero of the poem which appears very ridiculous. Poet Pampa dedicated his work *Vikramārjuna-vijaya*, otherwise known as *Pampabhārata*, to Arikēsari and he has been identified with the hero of the poem Arjuna. Likewise Ranna has dedicated his work *Gadāyuddha* to the Cālukya king Satyāśraya and there also he identifies him with the hero Bhīmasena of the poem.

of the work. This might be due to the influence of Kannaḍa tradition of dedication. None else followed this method of Nannecōḍa subsequently in Telugu Literature. There was also nobody who has dedicated his work to his *guru* except in Modern Times.[4]

The concept of comparing the poem with a virgin (*kanyā*) is not a new thing. Vāmana and Ānandavardhana have compared the *kāvya* with a lady (*yuvati*).[5]

Abhinavaguptapāda also mentioned about the *jāyāsammitatva* of the *kāvya*.[6] It is traditionally accepted that the *kāvya* is *kāntāsammita*, one which is comparable to a *kāntā* (lady) and that lady is none else than the wife (*jāyā*). Nannecōḍa compares his poem *Kumārasambhava* with a well developed celestial lady[7]. He dedicated it to Jaṅgama Mallikārjuna a celibate (*ājanmabrahmacārin*). Does it mean that he has given his work as a *jāyā* or wife to one who was a bachelor throughout? Here his comparison of the poem to a lady does not seem to be apt and appropriate. This contradiction is redressed when Tikkana (13th century) compares his work with a virgin (*kanyā*) and mentions it as *Bhāratīkanyā*. Manumasiddhi, the king used to address the poet as *māma* (father-in-law) in affectionate terms though he was not related to him as such and poet Tikkana makes his king ask for the *Bhāratīkanyā*, the virgin in the guise of poem to be given to him. so that the address that he was used to, become true.[8] The poet too recollected to his mind all the requisite qualities desirable of a bridegroom in the king and after satisfying himself, decided upon giving his poem to the king. This relationship made the king as *kṛtipati* and *kṛtibhartā* and the poet was considered to be the father of the poem, *kṛtikanyā-janaka* where the poem itself is a virgin to be given to one who is worthy and also deserves her. This comparison of the poem with a virgin was hailed as a good tradition and it was rightly followed by other poets as well. And this tradition still continues when the work is dedicated to persons other than ladies (mother, wife, sister, etc.) and also the children.

---

4. Piṅgaḷi and Kāṭūri have dedicated their joint work *Saundaranandamu* to their *gurus* Tirupati Veṅkata kavulu.
5. *yuvater iva rūpam aṅga kāvyaṃ svadate* - Vāmana.
prasiddhāvayavātiriktaṃ vibhāti lāvaṇyamivāṅganānām - Ānandavardhana.
6. *ko'sya kāvyarūpasya vyutpattihetoḥ |*
jāyāsammitatvalakṣaṇo viśeṣaḥ ||
7. *sakalāvayavambulambaripūrṇambaina divya kāvyāṅgana*, Kumāra.
8. *Kanda : ē ninnu māma yaniyeḍu*
dīniki daga nimmu bhāratīkanyaka; nā
kī narhuḍa vagu daninanu
bhūnāyaku palku cittamuna kimpaguḍun,
Nirva. 1-3.

After knowing the main characteristics of the tradition let us investigate into the history of it in Telugu. Nannaya (11th century) did not mention anywhere in the *Mahābhārata*, the first available work, that Rājarājanarendra was the recepient *(kṛtipati)* of his poem, nor the word *aṅkita* is found in it. In the prologue, the invocatory verses that are found towards the beginning of the work do not have the blessing for the *kṛtipati* as it used to be. Nor the prologue *(avatārikā)* contains the elaborate description of the *kṛtipati's* dynasty and also the verses with words that end in possessive case *(ṣaṣṭhyantamulu)* are found as in other works of the kind which were dedicated to kings and others. Rājarājanarendra simply asked his court-poet, Nannaya, to narrate to him the story of his ancestors which also happened to be the story of the *Mahābhārata*. And on his request Nannaya made Rājarājanarendra as his 'principal listener' *(prdhānaśrotā)* and narrated the story of the *Mahābhārata* to him. Hence we cannot say definitely whether the *Mahābhārata* has been dedicated to Rājarājanarendra or not. But peculiarly enough the verses that are found at the beginning and ending of each *āśvāsa* are addressed to him only and that makes us believe that the work was dedicated to him and hence he was the *kṛtipati* to certain extent. And it was Nannecōḍa who initiated first the tradition of dedication in Telugu and as it is already mentioned he dedicated his work *Kumārasambhava* to his religious teacher *(guru)* Jaṅgama Mallikārjuna.

Pālkuriki Somanātha (12th century) made Gōḍagi Tripurāri, Gobbūri Saṅganāmātya and Pālkuriki Sūranāmātya as principal listeners of his works *Anubhavasāra*, *Basavapurāṇa* and *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritra* respectively. But the *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritra* is dedicated to Basaveśvara. Though there is dedication, it is to a person other than the 'principal listener' *(pradhāna śrotā)*.[9] Thus there are both dedication and also narration of the story to a principal listener in this work. Both in *Basavapurāṇa* and *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritra* the principal listeners were addressed to in the verses that are composed at the beginning and ending of the chapters, *āśvāsas* and *prakaraṇas* as the case may be. Following the example of Pālkuriki Somana, a few poets made their friends as the principal listeners and narrated the story to them while they were listening to it.

Though we find verses addressing to Sāhiṇi Mārana in various *kāṇḍas* of the *Bhāskara-rāmāyaṇa* it does not seem to have been dedica-

9. *basavaliṅgamu gṛtipati yaṭe, kṛtiyu*
rasikata baṇḍitārādhyacaritra
maṭe, pālkuriki sōmanāryuḍu sukavi
yaṭe, kathāśrōta sūrāmātyuḍaṭte
kṛtipati gṛti gavi kathāśrōta
kṣiti jeppa noppadē śivabhakta sabhala, Paṇḍi. p. 22.

ted to him. The prologue (*avatārikā*) to the work is not available to us and hence we cannot say to whom it has been dedicated. Moreover the addresses in all the *kāṇḍas* are not uniform and it is not clear whether it has got any dedication at all. The chieftains that were described in the work may be taken as principal listeners. Pōtana (15th century) made his *guru* Ivvaṭūri Sōmaya as the listener of the story (*kathāśrotā*) in his work *Vīrabhadra-vijaya*. Baccu Siddha Kavi (17th century) also made Saṅgaya as the listener in his *Maṛi-basava-purāṇa*. The practice of writing a work as narrated to a principal listener did not gain much ground as a tradition in Telugu Literature, as the tradition of dedication swayed the field all through.

We find some works written in the name of the *kṛtipati* or the patron which is also to be reckoned with as one kind of dedication. The true sense of the term *aṅkita* is well brought out here as these poems are branded or marked in the name of the *kṛtipati*. We find this kind of thing in the *Raṅganātharāmāyaṇa* (14th century). Kōna Viṭhalanātha (recepient) the *kṛtipati* of the work asks his son, the author to write the work and mark it in his name.[10] He too, it is mentioned, has written in his father's name accordingly. Following the footsteps of the father Kāca and Viṭhalanātha, the two sons of Buddhabhūpati also wrote the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the great epic *Raṅganātha-rāmāyaṇa* in their father's name.[11] Gaurana (15th century) wrote *Navanāthacaritra* in the name of Mallikārjuna, the *kṛtipati*. Avaci Tippayaceṭṭi requested his boyhood friend, Śrīnātha, to write a *Śaiva-Prabandha* in his name and dedicate it to him.[12] The last illustration proves that branding the work in one's name and dedicate it to one is one and the same as *Haravilāsa* of Śrīnātha has been dedicated to Avaci Tippaya.

To have the works dedicated to themselves has become popular with the kings. Not only kings, but also their ministers, chieftains, commanders were patronising the poets and the poets in turn were dedicating their works to them. It has become a tradition with them. Not only mortals, but Gods too seemed to have evinced interest in it and have some kind of fascination towards the same. Hariharanātha appeared in the dream that Tikkana had and requested him to dedicate his *Mahābhārata* to him (Harihara). Perhaps the poets thought that

10. *tappaka nāpēra daga nāndhra bhāṣa*
jeppi prakhyātulu sēyimpu murvi
ātatakṛtipēra natipuṇyupēra
mā taṇḍri Viṭṭhalakṣmānāthupēra, Raṅga.

11. *mā taṇḍri buddhakṣamānāthupēra*
nātataghanupēra nanaghunipēra, Raṅga.

12. *śaivaprabandhamokaṭi*
yavadharimpumu nāpēra naṅkitamuga, Hara.

deities too would be very much interested to have the works dedicated in their name. Mañcana has dedicated his work to one Naṇḍūri Guṇḍaya, a Minister. Mārana, the desciple of Tikkana gave his work in dedication to one Gannaya, the commander of Kākatīya Pratāparudra. Thus it will be seen that not only kings, but also high dignitaries connected with the kingdom and court were used to be recepients *(kṛtipatis)* after Tikkana.

It will be interesting to note that a few poets who have dedicated their works to others were themselves *kṛtipatis* and they had a few works dedicated to them. It is the rare privilege of Tikkana to be both *kṛtikartā* (author) and *kṛtibharthā* (recepient or patron). Abhinavadaṇḍı Kētana dedicated his work *Daśakumāracaritra* to him.[13] Likewise Śrīkṛṣṇadēvarāya, Bhaṇḍāru Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa and Raghunāthanāyaka were not only poets themselves but also patrons or *kṛtipatis* of certain works as well.

Likewise there are cases where works more than one of the same author or of different authors dedicated to one and the same king. Eṛṛana (14th century) dedicated both his *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Harivaṃśa* to the Reḍḍi king, Prōlaya Vēma. The *Nāciketopākhyāna* of Dagguballi Dugganna and *Prabodhacandrodaya* of Nandi Mallaya and Ghaṇṭa Siṅgaya were dedicated to one and the same person, Cendalūri Gaṅgamantri. The *Manucaritra* and *Pārijātāpaharaṇa* were dedicated to the famous Śrīkṛṣṇadēvarāya. But there is some difference in the dedication of these works. While the *Manucaritra* was dedicated to him on the request of the king to the poet, Mukku Timmana has dedicated his work *Pārijātāpaharaṇa* voluntarily to Śrīkṛṣṇadēvarāya even though he did not ask him for it. Perhaps he thought that the poet after composing the poem should seek for a good bride-groom and dedicate it to him. The *Jaimini-bhārata* and *Sāḷuvābhyudaya* of different authours were dedicated to the Vijayanagara king, Sāḷuva Narasiṃharāya. Cēmakūra Veṅkaṭakavi has dedicated both his works *Vijayavilāsa* and *Sāraṅgadharacaritra* to Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore. The prologue *(avatārikā)* of the *Sāraṅgadharacaritra* is not available to us. But as the poet took a vow in his *Vijayavilāsa* that he would not dedicate his work to any one other than Raghunātha Nāyaka it can be rightly presumed that the *Sāraṅgadharacaritra* also might have been dedicated to him only. Raghunātha Nāyaka also had the privilege of having the work *Naiṣadhapārijātīya* of Kṛṣṇādhvarin dedicated to him. Kṛṣṇādhvarin is said to have dedicated some more works also to the same king. Liṅganamakhi

13. *kṛtulu raciyimpa sukavula*
kṛtuloppa gonaṅga norunikin dīrune vā-
kpatinibhuḍu vitaraṇaśrī-
yutu ḍannamasutuḍu tikka ḍokkaḍu dakkan,
Daśakumāracaritramu.

Śrīkāmeśvarakavi has dedicated his two works *Satyabhāmāsāntvana* and *Rukmiṇīpariṇaya* to the Nāyak king of Madurai, Muddaḷagiri (A.D. 1670). Gaṇapavarapu Veṅkaṭakavi wrote his *Vidyāvatīdaṇḍaka* under the patronage of Muddaḷagiri. Thus it is seen that kings and patrons of the Southern region had more than one work dedicated in their names than in the orher parts of the country.

There is one peculiarity in Śrīnātha's dedication of his works. Whenever he wanted to secure the patronage of a certain king and also a place in his court he tried to develop good relationship with the high dignitaries in the service of the said king by dedicating a work to him and through him he used to secure entrance into the Royal court. When he wanted to gain the patronage of Pedakōmaṭi Vēma he dedicated his work *Śṛṅgāranaiṣadha* to Māmidi Siṅgana, the king's minister. In order to achieve the patronage of Vēmā Reḍḍi and Vīrabhadrā Reḍḍi of Rājamahendravaram he had his work *Bhīmēśvarapurāṇa* dedicated to their minister, Beṇḍapūḍi Annamantri. He dedicated the *Haravilāsa* to Avaci Tippayaceṭṭi, his boyhood friend and also the official in charge of the storehouse of spices (*sugandhabhāṇḍāgāra)* of the king Kumāragiri Bhūpāla of Koṇḍavīḍu. He has dedicated his *Kāśikhaṇḍa* to Vīrabhadrā Reḍḍi towards the end of his life. Though he has dedicated most of his works to high dignitaries in Royal courts he sought to describe the kings as well in a casual manner who happened to be the bosses of his benefactors in order to gain their favour. He maintained this in the *ṣaṣṭhyantas* and also in the verses that are found at the beginning and ending of each chapter (*āśvāsa*).

A few poets have dedicated their works to their religious preceptors. Siṃhādri Veṅkaṭācārya has dedicated his work *Lakṣaṇāpariṇaya* alias *Camatkāramañjari* to one Varadācārya a famous Vaiṣṇavite ācārya. Likewise Bhānukavi dedicated his *Pañcatantri* to the famous master of music and dance in the royal harem of Śrī Kṛṣṇadēvarāya, Bhaṇḍāru Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa who was himself an author of a scientific work in Sanskrit called *Saṅgītasūryodaya.*

Eḍapāṭi Eṟṟana has dedicated his work *Śṛṅgāramalhaṇacaritra* to one Kāḷanamantri and he stated in his work that he has concealed the work for his sake and evaded dedicating it to Śrīkṛṣṇadēvaraya. The reason for his concealment and evasion is not known. Mādayagāri Mallana has dedicated his work *Rājaśekharacaritra* to Nādiṇḍla Appana, who was both a minister and commander and also happened to be the nephew and son-in-law of the famous minister, Timmarasu.

During the Vijayanagar period poets dedicated their works not only to ministers, commanders, chieftains and friends but also to ordinary employees of the Royal court. Tenāli Rāmaliṅgakavi dedi-

cated his work *Udbhaṭārādhyacaritra* to one Ūradēcamantri who was an executive officer in the service of Nādiṇḍla Gopa, the Governor of the fort at Koṇḍavīḍu. The same Rāmakṛṣṇakavi has dedicated his other work *Pāṇḍuraṅgamāhātmya* to one Virūri Vedādri who was a copyist *(vrāyasakāḍu)* in the service of Peda Siṅgabhūpāla. Rāmarājabhūṣaṇa has dedicated his work *Kāvyālaṅkārasaṃgraha* to Ōbhala Narasarāja, the nephew of Aḷia Rāmarāya and Tirumalarāya before he could enter into their court. After succeeding in gaining the favour of the kings through Ōbhala Narasarāya, Rāmarājabhūṣaṇa dedicated his *Vasucaritra* to Tirumalarāya. In Āravīḍu dynasty queens too evinced much interest in the promotion of literature. It is said Kōnēṭamma, the queen of Āravīṭi Tirumalarāya patronised literature and it seems she had a few works dedicated in her name. Andugula Veṅkayya, the author of *Rāmarājīya* vouchsafes the fact. But the details of her patronage are not known.

It will be interesting to note that Mohemmadan kings too patronised Telugu poets and had some works dedicated to them. Addaṅki Gaṅgādharakavi has dedicated his work *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇopākhyāna* to the Mohemmadan king of Gōlkoṇḍa. Malkibrahim alias Malkibharām as he was so affectionately addressed by Telugu poets. Before the dedication of this work it seems he had a few more works dedicated in his name. But we do not have the details. One Amīn Khān who was in the service of Malkibrahim received a poem *Yayāticaritra* of Ponnigaṇṭi Telagana in dedication to him and this was possible for Telagana through the good offices and inducement of Mariṅgaṇṭi Appana, an employee under Amīn Khān.

Though poets like Tikkana and Rāmarājabhūṣaṇa have dedicated their works to kings, they have dedicated their subsequent works to their *personal deities* (*iṣṭadaivas*). But these poets never hated the kings. As they could not, perhaps, get the patronage of kings, a few poets have resented them and dedicated their works to the God. Some have grown in wisdom subsequently and resented to dedicate their works to kings even though they have dedicated their subsequent works to God only. Pōtana (15th century), though he dedicated his first work to Rāvusiṅgabhūpāla, refused to dedicate his other work, the *Bhāgavata* to him though the king very much wanted to have it. He has dedicated his *Bhāgavata* to Lord Śrīrāma. His resentment is well evident in the much quoted *cāṭu*.[14] Baicarāju Veṅkaṭanātha also resented to dedicate his work to kings on the ground that they were

---

14. *immanujēśvarādhamula kicci purambulu vāhanambulun, sommulu gonni puccukoni cokki śarīramu vāsi kālucē, sammetaṭpōṭulam baḍaka sammati śrīhari kicci ceppe nī, bammera pōtarājokaḍu bhāgavatambu jagaddhitambugan,*

– Bhāgavata.

patronising light literature like *Ēlalu* and *Tandanālu* and also inferior variety of poetry. Molla (16th century), the author of the Rāmāyaṇa also followed Pōtana saying the tongue that was accustomed to praise Lord Śrīrāma would never relish in praising the petty kings as no one will relish ginger while consuming jaggery. Saṅkusāla Nṛsiṃhakavi (16th century) is said to have tried in vain to secure a place in the court of Śrīkṛṣṇadēvarāya. But while dedicating his work *Kavikarṇarasāyana* to Lord Śrī Raṅganātha he has dwelt at length about the insult done to him by the king and also the misgivings of the Royal court and its vagaries. Kākamāni Mūrtikavi also, it seems, tried to secure the royal patronage by dedicating his work to the kings and by that become rich but his efforts did not bear fruits. Then with vengence towards them he dedicated his work *Pāñcāli-pariṇayamu* to Śrī Raṅganātha and in it he made known in clear terms his resentment towards Kings. He described them as *vyāḷasvāntas* (*vyāḷasvāntulu*) persons with serpent (Tiger) like hearts. Kanuparti Abbayāmātya also resented the dedication of works to kings and had both of his works dedicated to his personal deity – Maṅgaḷagiri Narasiṃha. Gaṭṭu Prabhuvu also resented the dedication of works to mortals in his *Kucelopākhyānamu.* Some poets even though they have not resented this kind of dedication to mortals preferred to dedicate their works to their personal deities or some deity whatsoever. Tarigoppula Mallana the author of *Candrabhānucaritra* expressed that it was good fortune to have dedicated his work to his personal deity and he gave it to Dattātreya. We find poets who have dedicated their works to one of these Gods Hari, Hara and Hariharanātha.

Religious preceptors, heads of religious mutts also seem to have patronised the poets and have some works dedicated to them. Śānta Bhikṣā Vṛtti, the Head of a Jaṅgama Mutt at Śrīśailam encouraged his servant, Śāntayya, to have *Śivarātrimāhātmya* of the illustrious poet Śrīnātha, dedicated to him. He not only induced Śāntayya to become a *kṛtipati,* he too received a poem *Navanāthacaritra* by Gaurana in dedication.

Some poets have dedicated works to their fathers. We have dealt with previously with *Raṅganātha-rāmāyaṇa* and *Uttarakāṇḍadvipada* which were dedicated to the fathers of the authors concerned. Dāmerala Veṅgaḷabhūpāla (16th century) having been induced by Śrīrāma who appeared before him in his dream dedicated his work *Bahuḷāśva-caritramu* to his father Veṇkaṭādhīśa. Likewise Piṅgaḷi Sūrana has dedicated his last work *Prabhāvatīpradyumna* to his own father Amaranāmātya. Bhōsala Ekōji (1736) has dedicated his *Dvipadarāmāyaṇa* to his father Tulajabhūpāla. Savaram Cinanārāyaṇakavi has dedicated his work *Kuvalayāśvacaritra* to his foster-father, Pedanārāyaṇa. Tirumalarāja of Āravīḍu dynasty saw that Dōnēru Kōnērunāthakavi's *Bālabhāgavata* was dedicated to his father Rāmarāja Timmarāja.

Some poets having been induced by either their fathers or fore-fathers dedicated their works to some deities of their choice. Errana has dedicated his *Nṛsiṃhapurāṇa* to Ahobala Narasiṃha on the advice of his grandfather Erapōtasūri who appeared before him in his dream. Piṇḍiprōlu Lakṣmaṇakavi having been induced by his father in the dream dedicated his work *Laṅkāvijaya* to one Kuyyēṭi Gopāla.

Besides fathers and fore-fathers there were others also by whose inducement the poets dedicated their works. Having been encouraged by Cakkilāla Liṅgappa, Pōseṭṭi Liṅgana has dedicated his work *Nava-cōlacaritra* to Mṛtyuṃjayasvāmi. But it is to be noted that the episodes were addressed to Liṅgappa only and not to the deity to whom it has been dedicated. And it may be surmised that the inducer has taken the role of the principal listener (*pradhānaśrotā*) also as in works of early days. Nañjaya Timmarasu, one of the Ministers of Acyutadēva-rāya of Vijayanagar has requested Cintalapūḍi Ellanārya alias Rādhā-mādhavakavi to dedicate his work *Tārakabrahmarājīyamu* to Lord Śrīrāma. Piṅgaḷi Sūrana (16th century) dedicated his work *Rāghava-pāṇḍavīya* to Virūpākṣadeva on the desire of Ākuvīṭi Pedaveṅkaṭādri. So, as we had both the principal listener and the *kṛtipati* in *Paṇḍitā-rādhyacaritra* about which we had earlier discussed we have both the *kṛtipati* and the *kṛtiprēraka* (the person who induced him to dedicate) in certain works.

Thus we see that the tradition of dedication is prevalent in Telugu Literature allthrough, ofcourse, in different manifestations as observed above. The account will prove beyond doubt how kings and others were very much eager to have some works dedicated to them. The reason for such craving and desire may be the thought that their name will stand for ever associated with the work as Vinnakōṭa Peddana rightly puts it in his *Kāvyālaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi*. He says, 'one can go to heaven if he achieves fame. Fame he will have by *Śravya-kāvyas*. These *kāvyas* pre-vail on account of the poets. Without the association of poets, kings will not prosper. There were many kings who were not associated with poets. Can they be traced?'[15] It is this desire that prompted the kings and others to associate themselves with the poets by patronising them and also having their works dedicated to them. One more reason also might have prompted them. The poem is considered to be one of the seven *santānas* (institutions) that the king must cherish and among them the poem (*kṛti*) occupies a supreme place as the other six might perish or be destroyed, the poem alone stands for ever and it is thus unperishable (*khilamu gākuṇḍunadi*). This pious wish, that their name should be associated with the unperishable institution might have prompted the

15. *vinutayaśambunaṅ galugu viśrutanākanivāsa mayyaśo, jananamu śravyakāvya-mula saṅgati noppagu śravyakāvyamun, danaru gaviprabhāvamuna datkavisammati lēni rāju lē, puna viharimpa, ravvibhulu pōyinajāḍa leruṅga bōlunē.*

- Kāvyā. 3·90.

kings, etc., request the poets to dedicate their works to them. When the poets dedicated their works and thus enabled them to cherish their ambition of having their name stand for ever, the kings in turn, honoured the poets with huge gifts and grants of *Agrahāras*, etc. Thus the tradition rewarded both the recepient and the poet. Poets who have dedicated works to their personal deities and to persons belonging to their families have done so out of devotion, reverence, love and affection that they had towards them.

Dr. RAMESH SUNDARJI BETAI

MURDER IN THE DHARMASĀSTRA*

Murder and Sāhasa

It is interesting to note that this title of Murder has been dealt with by most of the scholars as a part of *sāhasa* that comprises of varied titles in the different Smṛtikāras. Murder is dealt with as *Kaṇṭakaśodhana* by Manu who gives a few interesting details of it. But, it must be conceded that looking to the graveness of the title, the treatment of it is comparably small in almost all the Smṛtis.

Manu

There are a few verses in and after his treatment of assault and theft and some at the end of his treatment of the eighteen titles in which Manu deals with murder. Here, it comes as a part of the titile known as *sāhasa* as it has happened in case of some other Smṛtikāras.

At first sight it does not become clear as to what Manu means by the title *sāhasa*. In VIII.322, Manu has referred to robbers as men entering into *sāhasa*. But that comes as a part of theft and is dealt with in the midst of the verses on theft and can be carefully compared to theft. From VIII.344 onwards, he deals with *sāhasa* proper and so, under the present title, it means something else. In the opinions of Medhātithi, it is robbery, rape, arson, cutting clothes or forcibly destroying property. But there is not much clarity in this. Kullūka has understood it as 'burning houses and taking away property.'[1] Even this is not quite to the point and full. The following points should be clearly understood to have a clear idea of the meaning of the word *sāhasa* in Manu.

(1) Manu asks the king not to disregard even for a moment one who has committed the offence of *sāhasa*.

---

* A chapter from a project aided by the Gujarat University.

1. Kullūka on *Manu-smṛti*, VIII.344.

(2) He further states that he is worse than a man who defames, steals and who assaults with a *daṇḍa*. He is the worst of the criminals (VIII.345).

(3) Manu states that the twice born should take up arms when *Dharma* is obstructed, and there is internal strife (VIII.348). Due to the use of the word *viplave* in the second line, it is understood as disturbance due to foreign invasions (Govindarāja, Kullūka, Sarvajananārāyaṇa, Rāghavānanda), as disturbance to the performance to the sacred duties, (Medhātithi) and also as disturbance due to famine (Nandana). None of the explanations is satisfactory or clear.

(4) Manu again states that if a man comes to attack with the intention to kill (*vadha*), the person who attacks may be killed even without any hesitation even if he be a *Guru*, or a *Brāhmaṇa*, and adds that there is no crime in killing the would be assassin in public or in private. The commentators have misunderstood this verse and have given fantastic explanations of it,[2] but it is clear that this is right of self-defence given to man and it would be given to any man in any society and it is given by the Indian Penal Code also.

Thus, it can be seen that under the title of *sāhasa*, Manu includes all the cases of grossest violence to life and to property. The first and the second points show that the *sāhasika* is worse than even a robber. The third point establishes beyond doubt that all those who plot against the Government or damage or burn public property or create a mutiny are *sāhasikas*. The word will therefore mean 'cases of grossest violence to life and property' and this will include mutineer murderers, persons who kidnap women and so on. Rape is treated as a part of *strīsaṃgrahaṇa* and so, it cannot be included here as Medhātithi does. Robbery is named *sāhasa* but it is treated as a part of theft and so, it should not be included here.

Manu's view on *sāhasa*, now treated as murder, mutiny, etc., is based on the following ideas at the root :-

(1) Manu wants that the king should put down these serious crimes with a stern hand and so, severest punishments are laid down for it. He insists that there shall be no danger to public property and life, and all

2. It will then be a murder without intention and in self-defence and so it is not to be punished. Kullūka does not convince us when he says that 'man should kill the would be assassin who is an elder only if one is not able to save ones life by flight; 'or that' one must not hurt such an assassin too much' as Sarvajananārāyaṇa points out. The whole problem of killing the teacher is explained by the *Madanapārijāta* when it states that 'the case is not of one man killing another, but the animosity of one man destroying the animosity of another.'

elements that destroy public peace and safety, shall be put down with a high hand. The Indian Penal Code has also been required to provide for very severe punishment in several sections for all such cases of grossest violence that includes murder. It is of interest to note again that even when the talk of eradicating the punishment of death for murder and similar offences from the Indian Penal Code comes again and again in parliament, it does not pass.

(2) He wants all members of the society and the persons at the relm of affairs in particular, to remain alert against such cases of violence.

(3) He gives due and just right of protection, self-defence to all men, against all types of assassins.

Thus, various writers include various crimes under the title of *sāhasa*, Manu differs from them to a considerable extent. He is frank and outspoken about suppressing the criminals under title *sāhasa*. He will not permit detailed procedure and complexities and court procedure that last for a long time, and when he lays down the rules as we have detailed above, we can state that besides court-proceedings, there must be clarity in his mind about the measures that may be stated to be similar to the 'Court Martial' of present days.

YĀJÑAVALKYA

It is a matter of great interest that in his title of *sāhasa*, Yājñavalkya does not refer to murder. His definition of *sāhasa* in 2. 230 shows that it refers to various kinds of robbery and similar offences that are committed by force, but he does not refer to murder in it. It is also of interest that Vijñāneśvara in his *Mitākṣarā* expands the definition given by Yājñavalkya thus :-

sāmānyadravyaprasabhaharaṇāt sāhasaṃ smṛtam /
tanmūlyād dviguṇo daṇḍe nihnave tu caturguṇaḥ //[3]

Here the *Mitākṣarā* has these remarks :- 'Here we have to state this. The definition of *sāhasa* should really include all cases of killing, kidnaping, assault on some one else's wife and so on, which are carried out in the presence of king's men and other men after disregarding the rule of kingly power and the cries of other persons.' The *Mitākṣarā* thus sees to the grave limitation of the definition of *sāhasa* and therefore tries to improve upon it by the inclusion of murder under it. It again refers to murder in the section on *prāyaścitta* when it refers to the murder of a *brāhmaṇa* in III. 227 in the comments and then to the murder of women in his comments on III. 266 and to the killing of a *vaiśya* and *Śūdra* in its comments on III. 267.

3. *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*, II. 230.

This should not however lead us to conclude that Yājñavalkya does not refer to murder at all. He specifically refers to murder in several verses and the most important references are these: In II. 271,[4] the author refers to the *ghāta* of men, animals, etc., and makes the leader of the village, the headman responsible for this. In II. 273,[5] he again refers to persons who forcibly attack and kill and wants that such persons shall be hanged. In II. 277[6] again he refers to fight with arms that might result in death of a person and this will amount to murder. He has, in II. 280 and 281, referred to the mode of inquiry when a murderer is not known or caught. In II. 279[7] he referred to the case of a woman poisoning her husband and the punishment that she is to undergo. All these references show that Yājñavalkya knows well of this offence. He asks the king to inquire deeply into the cases of murder and in all cases of murder the only punishment is dealt by hanging or in various ways such as the drowning of a woman who poisons her husband, by tying stones round her body and drowning her (II.278).[8] But, since he has not referred to murder in one of the titles, it seems that in all probabilty, cases of murder were dealt with directly by the king and these cases were not brought before the courts of law. The poor references in Manu as also in Nārada prove this contention as a very much likely probability. We know that in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka, there is reference to the trial of Cārudatta on a charage of murder.[9] This probably refers to some later convention after the rules of Viṣṇu and Bṛhaspati became popular or it refers to the case of a part of the country in which the practices of Nārada, etc., were unknown. But here also, it is interesting to note that the case is tried, judgment is given and then the case is referred to the king for his final orders, and the judges recommend mercy on the ground that Cārudatta is a man of high status and a good character. For our purpose the fact of interest is that the king is the final authority in matters of the offence of murder and only he issues final orders in the matter of the sentence of death of a person. It should not be a matter of surprise to us to note this because, even in the treatment of the title in Kauṭilya it seems that all cases of *kaṇṭakaśodhana* were tried by separate courts that were in greater control of the king and

---

4. *ghātite 'pahnute doṣo grāmabhartur anirgate |*
vivītabhartus tu patiḥ cauroddhar suravītake || II. 271.
5. *bandigrāhāṃs tathā vājikuñjarāṇāṃ ca hāriṇaḥ |*
prasahyaghātinaś caiva śūlān āropayen narān || II. 273.
6. *śastrāvapāte garbhasya pātane cottamo damaḥ |*
uttamo vādhamo vāpi puruṣastrīpramāpaṇe || II. 277.
7. *viṣāgnidāṃ patiguru nijāpatyapramāpaṇīm |*
vikarṇakaraṇāsauṣṭhīm kṛtvā gobhiḥ pramāpayet ||
8. *vipraduṣṭāṃ striyaṃ caiva puruṣaghnīm agarbhiṇīm |*
setubhedakarīṃ cāpsu śilām baddhvā praveśayet ||
9. In Act 9.

the cases of murder were an important part of this *kaṇṭakaśodhana.* Nārada also does not add anything substantial to this and so, it will now be desirable for us to go directly to Viṣṇu and Bṛhaspati.

VIṢṆU

Viṣṇu deals with the title of murder in V. 48 to 57 and V. 188 onwards.[10] He has expanded the definition of the title, we might say, when he has referred not only to killing of human beings but also to killing of animals, wild and domestic (V. 48 to 52) and at the same time to feller of trees and the man who cuts creepers, shurbs, etc. (V.57). He then refers to the killing of wild animals in self-defence and also to killing of anyone in self-defence (V. 188 to 189).[11] He again refers to the fact that killing an assassin is no offence,[12] no crime and he gives the reason of that when he states that this is because fury recoils upon fury (V.190). He next refers to seven types of assassins that kill men in various ways, by sword, poison, fire, curse and so on. But it is interesting to note that he gives no other detail besides this as to how a murderer is to be traced, how he is to be tried, how he is to be punished and so on, as we have in Kauṭilya, etc. Kauṭilya has given the fullest details of these and also of how assassins are to be punished, after due trial of course, in a court of law that exclusively deals with *kaṇṭakaśodhana* in which Kauṭilya brings in several very important offences. Viṣṇu is interesting with the seven types of the assassins that he has described and with that he more or less stops. It seems that he follows the foot-steps of the predecessor in the rest of the matters pertaining to this offence.

KAUṬILYA

The interesting detail in Kauṭilya is to be studied from the fourth section of his work that he knows as *Kaṇṭakaśodhana*. His interesting contribution shall be noted thus :

(1) He refers to murder and suicide both in his treatment and gives the details of how both are to be assessed and checked. He probably wants that no offence of murder shall escape as that of suicide.

(2) From his point of view, even suicide is a serious offence. Just as one has no right to take some one else's life, one has also no right to take ones own life and so, there are punishments for both.

(3) Kauṭilya has, like all others, reserved the punishments of death and that too by various modes for all persons who take life, but he is very much careful and detailed in the method and manner of tracing the real offender and the trial and the quickness with which the

10. Vide. Translation in Sacred Books of the East, vol. VII.

11. ibid.

12. ibid.

judgement shall be given, after of course seeing to it that due inquiry has been made in all speed so that evidence is not made to disappear.

(4) He gives the right of self-defence to the accused and he sees to it that justice is done to his case.

Kauṭilya is thus useful in fixing the details of the mode of inquiry, the trial at the proper time, the due right of the accused for defence and so on. He has made the title strictly legal unlike all others who have discussed the title.

BṚHASPATI

It is an interesting surprise that unlike all other Smṛtikāras, Bṛhaspati is very much systematic in the treatment of this title and he is very clear. He deals with the title in his treatment of *sāhasa*. To him *sāhasa* is of four types: homicide, theft, assault on another's wife and the two kinds of injury (XXII.1.). He deals with murders along with his treatment of the title of theft and this is not a surprise due to the fact that in cases of theft and robbery there was every likelihood of a shuffle in which murders might take place. He therefore deals with murder when he comes to theft plus violence (XXII. 23). He makes the following very interesting provisions:

(1) Man-slaughter is the worst of murders and for that there can be no punishment other than death (29). It is interesting to note that here he does not refer to punishment in accordance with the higher or the lower *varṇa* of the accused, though he will concede that a brahmin shall not suffer corporal punishment.

(2) In any state there will be dacoits, notorious murderers and secret assassins. Bṛhaspati states that the king shall become very stiff with them and they shall be put to death in the most cruel way after their property is confiscated (XXII.30).

(3) There will again be cases in which one man is attacked by many. In such a case it will become very difficult to fix the murder who shall of course suffer the heaviest punishment. In this case Bṛhaspati states that one who strikes the fatal blow shall be the murderer. He shall be sentenced and put to death and the rest shall suffer lesser punishment (XXII.31).

(4) Bṛhaspati gives the details also of how an inquiry is to take place, how there shall be the quest of the alleged offender, how he is to be searched after, how his guilt is to be established and so on. (XXII.33 onwards). This shows that Bṛhaspati gives the minutest details of how this offence is committed and how the culprit is to be traced and how he

is to be tried and sentenced and so on. Bṛhaspati stands as the most systematic writer here of course along with Kauṭilya.

Kauṭilya is very much specific when he places murder and suicide under *kaṇṭakaśodhana* and in our chapter on Kauṭilya, we have shown how there is all likelihood of there being separate courts for this and the further likelihood that the king was far closer to these courts. The positions in Manu, Yājñavalkya and Nārada is not that clear and it seems that in all probability, the offences of murder, etc., were dealt with directly by the king or his confident minister or judge and the order of the king was expected to be final in the matter. These two are the possibilities and this should not surprise us because protection to life of the subjects was one of the most important of the duties of the ruler. Again, there was always the possibility of political murders and just as they are to be dealt with by the king, the cases of murder in general are, it seems entrusted to the care of the king, and ordering trial or otherwise is probably left to him.

One more interesting fact is that even in the case of murder, the distinction between cognisable and non-cognisable offences is not known and the king has almost absolute powers in matters of law, the criminal in particular. Offences are thus of three types :

(1) The Civil offences that are rightly known as *Dharmasthīyam* by Kauṭilya, though he incorporates in these some criminal offences that are separated by Manu, etc.

(2) The criminal offences that are known as *kaṇṭakaśodhana* or otherwise, but in the case of which there is a quick disposal and there are more of corporal and physical punishments.

(3) Offences, mostly criminal that are to be dealt with exclusively by the king and there may or may not be a regular trial in such cases. In case of political offences of murder, etc., there were no trials and the word of the king was final.

Again, in most of the cases of murder, the punishment is death and no writer has shown any compromise in this. Treating of the instinct of criminality as a disease and showing sympathy towards the offender is a modern trend it is not to be found in any country in the world either in the days of Manu or even till the last century. The Smṛtikāras do not go into the reasons of criminality and take for granted that there are bounds to be, in any society, even the best, some persons, who will be criminals, and the only thing that law and king can do is to punish them and eradicate criminality from the society. They do not believe and in their days it was not possible for them to believe that every

school opened is a jail closed. At this stage it must, however, be accepted, to give justice to the ideal of monarchy in the days of Manu and Kauṭilya that they wanted the king or the ruler to guarantee full safety and security of bread to one and all in the society. It is, therefore, natural that they then did not accept that any man might commit crimes due to shortage of food and because he starves.

Dr. N. SUBBU REDDIAR

IYAṚPĀ AND TIRUMUṚAIS*

A brief comparative study

The Fourth book of *Nālāyiram*, *Iyarpā*, as it stands today, consists of eleven poems of six Āḷvārs namely First three Āḷvārs (Poykaiyaḷvār, Pūtattāḷvār and Peyāḷvār), Tirumaḷicaiyāḷvār, Nammāḷvār and Tirumaṅkaiyāḷvār, the eleventh poem *Rāmānuca-nūṟṟantāti* being the composition of one later day devotee known as Amutaṉār. The *Tirumuṟais* (the Śaivite canon) are twelve in number consisting of twenty seven saints and poets from Tirumūlar the earliest saint of time and Cēkkiḷār the latest. A brief comparative study may be attampted here. The study undertaken is no more than citing some interesting parallels in attitudes and expressions between the works of the Āḷvārs and the Śaivite *Tirumuṟais*; no exhaustive listing or study of similar sentiments and phrases occurring in these two sets of works has been aimed at here, for such a study will be far beyond the scope of the present paper and may well be a research project by itself.

Iyaṟpā stands in comparison with the *Eleventh Tirumuṟai*. On their very face both are collections of miscellaneous poems of different authorship. Of the eleven poems in the *Iyaṟpā* the eleventh poem *Rāmānuca-nūṟṟantāti* is a later day addition after the date of redaction by Nāthamuni whereas the *Eleventh Tirumuṟai* itself is a collection of poems coming at a later date after Nampiyāṇṭār Nampi made his arrangement of the Śaivite works. The former work consists of the following types of poems :

---

* Paper presented in the 4th seminar-conference held on 10th, 11th and 12th June, 1972 at Trivendrum organised under joint auspices of Indian Uni versity Tamil Teachers' Association and the University of Kerala.

Types	Number of poems
Antātis	6
Āciriyam	1
Viruttam	1
Maṭals	2
Eḻukkūrrirukkai	1
Total	11 poems (five types)

The latter has the following types of poems, arranged in the order of the traditional age of the authors :

Types	Number of poems
Antāti	8
Āṟṟuppaṭai	1
Iraṭṭaimaṇi Mālai	4
Ulā	2
Ēṭṭu	1
Eḻukkūṟṟirukkai	1
Eḻupatu	1
Ēkātaca Mālai	1
Orupā orupaktu	1
Kalampakam	1
Kali Veṇpā	1
Kōpap-pracātam	1
T[illegible]k..p-pācu[illegible] or Ciṭṭukkavi	1
Tokai	1
Nānmaṇi Mālai	1
Patikam	2
Peruntēvapāṇi	1
Maṟam	2
Mummaṇikkōvai	7
Viruttam	2
Veṇpa	1
Total	41 poems (twenty one types)

In *Iyaṟpā* out of eleven poems ten are on the Lord Viṣṇu and one about an aṭiyār (devotee). In the *Eleventh Tirumuṟai* out of forty one poems twenty seven are on Lord Siva, three on God Vināyaka, one on the various sacred places and ten about the aṭiyārs (devotees).

Nampiyāṇṭār Nampi has contributed nine poems to this collection.[1] Again one can see no stamp of the author's name in any of the

1. 11. 32 to 41

poems in the Fourth Book of *Nālāyiram* except in *Tiruviruttam.* But even Nammālvār who puts his name-stamp in all his poems does not do so in his *Tiruvāciriyam* and *Periya Tiruvantāti*. But a few of the poems in the *Eleventh Tirumurai* have the author's stamp on them.[2]

In the *Iyarpā* five *Tiruvantātis* are on Lord Viṣṇu and one *Antāti* is about Rāmānuja. In the Śaivite canon six *Tiruvantātis* are on Lord Śiva, one about the sixty three devotees of Śiva, and one about Tirujñanacampantar. One verse in the *Mutal Tiruvantāti*[3] describing the form of God as He manifests Himself in the five elements is similar to one in the Kāraikkāl Ammaiyār's *Arputa Tiruvantāti.*[4] The idea that God will come to the devotees in the form in which they long for Him to come to them is found in both the poems.[5] Poykaiyālvār describes the image of God where one half is Śiva and the other half Viṣṇu and Kārikkāl Ammaiyār visualises Śiva as having Viṣṇu on his one side and his consort Umā on the other. Pēyālvār also expresses a similar sentiment.[6] According to Poykaiyālvār the eight-lettered mantra (Om Namo Nārāyaṇāya) is the only means leading us to mokṣa, the goal of human endeavour' and according to Kapilatēva Nāyanār the Lord's name in our tongue serves us as a step for voyaging towards our ultimate goal.[7] The same sentiment is expressed by Tirunāvukkaracar slightly in a different way. According to him one need not have any fears about Yama as one has the tongue to utter God's name.[8] There are parallel statements, in the *Mutal Tiruvantāti* and the *Eleventh Tirumurai*; both the saints say that even if the devotees commit mounting blunders, the Lord will condone all of them and take only their good acts into account.[9]

One cannot define the Lord's form as He takes any form to alleviate the difficulties of His devotees, according to Pūtattālvār[10]' and Kāraikkāl Ammaiyār expresses the same sentiment in a slightly different way. She poses the question which is the real from of God – whether it is in the form of half-man and half-woman or whether it is the form incorporating Tirumāl in His body or whether it is the form besmeared with the white ashes and riding on the bull.[11] There is one

2. 11.1,2,3,5,7 and 24
3. *Mutal Tiruvantāti* (M.T.) 29
4. 11.5:21
5. M.T. 44 = 11.5:33
6. *Mūnrām Tiruvantāti* (Mū.T) 63
7. M.T 95 = 11.23:86
8. *Tevāram* 5.91:6
9. M.T. 41 = *Tiruvācakam* (TVK) 493
10. *Irantām Tiruvantāti* (I.T.) 60
11. 11.5:59

beautiful description of Tirumalai (Tirupati Hill) by Pūtattāḻvār. He shows a male elephant having a very tender plant of bamboo dipped in honey in his trunk and offering it to his consort the female elephant[12] A similar situation is shown by Nakkīratēva Nāyanār who says that the male elephant is putting a small branch of a sandal tree dipped in honey in the mouth of his consort, the female elephant.[13] Many of the activities of the monkeys and elephants of Tirumalai as shown by the first three Āḻvārs and those shown by Nakkīratēva Nāyanār in his *Tiruīyṅkōymalai Eḻupatu* are similar and are vivid.[14] A sort of similarity occurs in the statements of Pūtattāḻvār and Kāraikkāl Ammaiyār. Both consider themselves as the real tapasvins as they have a strong desire to remove the roots of their birth, the former by placing a garland of Tamil verses at the feet of His Lord[15] and the latter by surrendering herself to Him and becoming a slave to Him [16] A parallel statement occuring both in Pūtattāḻvār's poem and *Tiruvācakam* can also be noticed. The Āḻvār does not desire to be a ruler of this earth nor does he aspire to have the position of Indra, the king of the celestials after having worshipped Lord Viṣṇu.[17] Saint Māṇikkavācakar says that he is not afraid of birth or death nor does he desire to have a kingdom on this earth or in heaven[18].

The idea that the servants of Yama (Naman tamar) would not dare to approach the devotees of Viṣṇu as expressed by Poykaiyāḻvār[19], Tirumaḻicaiyāḻvār,[20] Toṇṭaraṭip-poṭiyāḻvār,[21] Tirumaṅkaiyāḻvār,[22] and Nammāḻvār[23] is expressed by Nakkīratēva Nāyaṉār also.[24] But in the poems of Tirumaḻicaiyāḻvār and Nakkīratēva Nāyaṉār the statements are exactly similar. Here Yama gives instructions to his servants not to approach the devotees of the Lord, but to bow to them respectfully and go away from them politely. The same sentiment has been expressed by Campantar also.[25]

12. I.T. 75
13. 11.11:38
14. Cf. *Tēvāram* 1.70
15. I.T. 74
16. 11.5:7
17. I.T. 90
18. T.V.K. *Tiruccatakam*-12
19. M.T. 55
20. *Nāṉmukaṉ Tiruvantāti* (Naṉ. T) 68
21. *Tirumālai* 1
22. *Periya Tirumoḻi* (Peri. Tm) 8.10:6
23. *Tiruvāymoḻi* (T.V.M.) 10.2:1 Cf. ibid. 3.2:10
24. 11.10:85,86. Cf. *Tēvāram* 2.48:5; 7.55:1; 7.90
25. *Tēvāram* 3 49:4

A rare proverb occurs both in the Nammālvār's *Tiruviuttam*[26] and in Māṇikkavācakar's *Tiruvācakam*.[27] The mode of citation in the former makes it highly probable that this poem has taken it from somewhere else. The sentiment of self-surrender expressed in a verse of the former is identical to that in all the ten stanzas of *aṭaikkalap-pattu* of the latter[28]. But *Tiruviruttam* corresponds more with Māṇikkavācakar's other work *Tirukkōvaiyār*.[29] Both are the poems of *Akam* theme, highly mystic in nature; they are allegorical poems, which express the love of the soul for the Lord. The former contains one hundred verses in the *antāti* arragement and the latter four hundred verses on almost all approved themes (*tuṟais*) of *Akam* subject-matter schematically arranged; but the verses here are not in the *antāti* arrangement. Students of the history of Tamil Literature will know that *Akam* verses of the Caṅkam age which were unconnected dramatic monologues led to the development of the epic by something like the combination of monologues. Literary pieces came to be written consisting of a series of speeches of the lovers and the people around them, so as to present a continuous romantic story starting from the first meeting of the lovers and with their living together in peace. The epic poem in which the illustrative headings of the various *Akam* contexts arranged in their historical sequence is called '*Kovai*'. This is the difference between the earlier and later poetics. Māṇikkavācakar's poem is the second attempt, the first one being in *Iṟaiyanār Akapporuḷ*. As Māṇikkavācakar' *Kovai* is held in great veneration, it is called *Tirukkōvaiyār* with the prefix '*tiru*' (sacred) and with the suffix '*ār*' (the honorific singular) generally used for great men but coming to be added also to names of great literary pieces. It appears to me that in Nammālvār's poem as the verses are not schematically arranged as in the case of Māṇikkavācakar's poem it cannot be classified as obeying to the *Kovai* type of literature and so it has not been given the name of *Kovai* but given the name *Viruttam*, the type of metre, *Kaṭṭaḷaikkalitturai*, which, in those days, was known as 'viruttam'. The poems are similar in the sense that both are an account of the piligrimage of the soul to its real Self; the soul in both the cases having beheld the Divine turns Godward. In Nammālvār's poem the lady love is the soul and the hero is God, which is the ordi-

26. T.V.R. ·4
27. T.V.K. 91
28. T.V.R. 85 = T.V.K. 408–417
29. The metre of T.V.R. is *Kaṭṭaḷaik-kalitturai* which is the metre of the poems of *Tirukkovaiyār* also. Poems on *Kaṭṭalaikkalitturai* were called viruttams in those days This metre is the same as taravukkoccakam referred to in *Tolkāppiyam*-ceyyuliyal (Sut. 155. Pērāciriyar's commentary). Vide. Vellaivāraṇan, K; *Panniru Tirumuṟai Varalāṟu* Vol. I pp. 321–332. Cf. Meenakshisundaram, T.P.: *A History of Tamil Literature* pp. 65, 73.

nary trend of the mystic poetry. But in *Tirukkōvaiyār* the lady love is God and the hero is the soul[30].

Another common peculiarity that can be noticed between the works of the Āḷvārs and Nāyanmārs is that when the Āḷvārs bring in the *Akam* theme they make the whole decads carry the theme whereas when the Nāyanmārs handle the same theme they do so in individual verses in this decad or that.[31]

The *Tiruvāciriyam* of Nammāḷvār and the *Orupā orupaktu*[32] of Paṭṭinattār are similar. Both are in *āciriyappā* metre and are in the *antāti* arragement. The former consists of seven verses and the latter ten. The emphasis on number may again been seen in the latter. The opening verses in the two poems describe the grand forms of their respective Lords; the former describe the Thirivikkirama avatār and the latter the presiding deity at Tirivoṟṟiyūr near Madras. Even mythology becomes real and vivid in the hands of these two imaginative saints. The mythological stories become to them revelations of how only the love of their respective Lords removes obstructions. It is not the beginning or the middle but the final end of these episodes, namely. the loving victory and joy of their Lords, born of their satisfaction of serving us that is emphasised in these references in the mythological stories. The fifth verse in the Āḷvār's poem contains the famous story of Bali. After getting the boon of having three feet of the land from the asura king, the Lord assumes His universal form to measure out the earth and heavens with His feet. After measuring two He finally puts His foot on the head of Bali for the third foot of land. It is the joy of the Lord in touching His children - all living beings - in this act of measurement that is emphasised in this episode. The idea of inspiring the future generations with hope and love through and by this story is also important, as we shall note. Similarly the exploits of Lord Śiva finds a place in the poem of Paṭṭinattār.[33] References to the incidents of burning Tiripura, the

30. This is the interpretation of Cīkāli Thāndavarāyar and a few others. But this interpretation had been refuted pointing out that it is against the tradition and against the intention of Mānikkavācakar. (Vide: Vellaivāraṇan, K: *Panniru Tirumuṟai Varalāṟu*-Vol II pp. 273-277).

31. T.V.M. 1.4; 8.9; etc., Peri.Tm. 2.7; 9.4; etc., = *Tēvāram*.

32. 11.31. This is one kind of interest in numbers exhibited by the poets of later period composing verses upto a specific number. There are poems of five verses reminding us of five precious gems (*Pañcaratnamālai*), or of nine verses reminding of nine gems *Navaratnamālai*). The numbers ten and hundred are of greater frequency. For the former *Pattu* or *Patikam* or *Orupā orupaktu* and for the latter *Kalampakams*, *Antātis Mālais* may be cited as examples.

33. 11.31:3

incidents at Dakṣa's sacrifice, the removing of one head of Brahmā, the destruction of Manmata (Cupid), the story of Rāvaṇa being pressed under the mount Kailāsa and the episode of saving Mārkaṇṭeya from the hands of Yama are given in the verse. It is only the Lord's infinite mercy which is brought out in all these stories. The Āḷvār emphasises the importance ofself-surrender to His feet;[34] to him Lord Viṣṇu is the only God and he will worship only Him.[35] Similarly the feet of Śiva are the only ship to Paṭṭinattār by which he will sail[36] and he will perform worshipping only to those feet and no other[37]. Paṭṭinattār's poems though written on grand style full of captivating similes and charming descriptions give only the message of Śaivite Nāyanmārs in a simple language.

There is a similar idea being expressed by Nammāḷvār in his *Periya Tiruvantāti*[38] and by Māṇikkavācakar in his *Tiruvācakam*.[39] The Āḷvār asks the Lord whether He is going to take him to his fold by virtue of His operative grace or whether He is going to prescribe the arduous and steep paths or *aṣṭāṅga yōga* before He takes him. Similarly Māṇikkavācakar asks the Lord whether He is going to take him to His feet or whether he is pushing him to another cycle of birth or births. Both of them are anxious to know their Lord's will.

The interest evinced by the poets in the significance of numbers has already been pointed out.[40] Their interest in these is revealed in the arrangement of these numbers either in the ascending or in the descending order, first in the ascending and then in the descending order. Even saints like Tirumaṅkaiyāḷvār and Jñanacampantar indulge in this kind of game in their poems. In their poems of acrostics known as *Tiruveḻukkūṟṟirukkai*[41] one can see this aspect of similarity. The two poems are thus arranged in the form of a ratha or chariot:

---

34. TVC. 5
35. ibid. 7
36. 11.31 : 8
37. 11.31 : 9
38. P.Tv. 6
39. T.V.K. 415
40. Appar plays with the number five in different meanings in one verse. *Tēvāram* 4.26 : 5
41. Tirumaṅkaiyāḷvār's *Tiruveḻukkūṟṟirukkai* = *Tēvāram* 1.128

1 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1

---

1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 3 - 2 - 1
1 - 2 - 1

It may be noted that the upper half and the lower half of this arrangement are symmetrical in their number of rows and the number of compartments in each row. This type of poem is composed with the words and phrases denoting these numbers in such a way that they may be arranged in the form as shown above. The Āḷvār's poem consisting of forty five lines is a Hymn of Surrender to the presiding deity at Kumbakōṇam while the Nāyaṉār's consisting of the same number of lines is a Hymn of Praise to the Lord Śiva. The latter's poem is the first of its kind in the Tamil literature[42] upon which the later poems of this kind have been modelled. The Āḷvār's poem is in the *nilaimaṇṭila āciriyappā* while Campantar's poem is in the *iṇaikkuṟaḷāciriyappā* metres.

To Tirumaṅkaiyāḷvār's two *Maṭals* there are no counterpart in the Śaivite *Tirumuṟais*. In fact, one does not come across this type of composition in the whole range of these works. But one can see a proverb occurring in Tirumaṅkaiyāḷvār's *Ciṟiya Tirumaṭal* and Tirunāvukkaracar's *Tēvāram*[43] in which all the stanzas of a patikam end with a proverb. The Parakāla Nāyaki pleads that Kāma is the goal of life because among the three goals Dharma, Artha and Kāma those who realise the goal of Kāma do realise the other two goals also automatically; but it is curious, according to her, to believe that to attain what is called mokṣa, the unattainable, which is also beyond human conception, is like leaving a hare to escape and chasing a crow which reminds us the trite and homely saying that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. It is only a foolish hunter who is fond of eating flesh who will allow a hare whose flesh is palatable to eat and chase a crow

42. *Periyapurāṇam* – Tirujñāna 276.
43. C. Tml. Kaṉṉi 5 = *Tēvāram* 4.5:2.

whose flesh even if the bird is caught, is not palatable and is quite useless. Similar is the foolish action of those who give up Kāma and are in pursuit of mokṣa.

The *Rāmānuca-nūṟrantāti* stands in comparison with the six works of Nampiyāṇṭār Nampi viz, *Āḷuṭaiyapiḷḷaiyār Tiruvantāti*, *Āḷuṭaiyapiḷḷaiyār Tiruccaṇpai Viruttam*, *Āḷuṭaiyapiḷḷaiyār Tiru-mummaṇikkōvai*, *Āḷuṭaiyapiḷḷaiyār Tiruvulāmālai*, *Āḷuṭaiyapiḷḷaiyār Tirukalampakam* and *Āḷuṭaiyapiḷḷaiyār Tiruttokai*. Tiruvarankattamutaṉār's work briefly gives references to the twelve Āḷvārs[44] and Ācāryas[45] though it is a poem about the Rāmānuja's qualities and his services to the Vaiṣṇavism and the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy. It is a poem of one devotee about another devotee who has done yeoman service to his religion and philosophy. One can see here the deep and intense devotion of Amutaṉār to his Ācārya[46] at the same time revealing his master's devotion to the Lord[47] and to the Āḷvārs[48] especially Nammāḷvār and his works[49] and also to the devotees of Viṣṇu[50]. Some biographical incidents of Rāmānuja are also found in the poem[51]. But Nampiyāṇṭār Nampi on the lines of '*Tiruttoṇṭattokai*' of Campantar has produced a work called *Tiruttoṇṭar Tiruvantāti* about the devotees of Śiva including Campantar, Appar and Cuntarar[52]. But Māṇikkavācakar's name is not found either in the Cuntarar's *Tiruttoṇṭattokai*[53] or Nampiyaṇṭār Nampi's *Tiruttoṇṭar Tiruvantāti*. Nampiyantar Nampi's *Āḷuṭaiya Piḷḷaiyār Tirvantāti* corresponds to Amutanar's poem in many respects. It shows his deep and intense devotion to Tirujñānacampantar[53], the incidents in the life of his great master[54] and his master's devotion to Lord Śiva[55]. Unlike Amutaṉār, Nampi has introduced the *Akam* element in his verses. So these sections of the poem are either in the words of the hero, the heroine or her maid. It may also be stated that as many as six poems about Campantar may also be taken as an index of Nampi's great devotion to his master Campantar. His other five poems also contain these aspects.

---

44. *Rāmānuca-nūṟrantāti* (R.N.) 8-19.
45. R.N. 20, 21
46. ibid 2, 4, 5, 6, 24, 25 etc.,
47. ibid 28, 30, 33, 36, 40 etc.,
48 ibid 8 to 10
49. ibid 18, 19, 20, 29, 64
50 ibid 51, 57
51. ibid 58, 64, 65, 68, 91. 99
52. 11.34
53. 11.35: 2, 18, 24, 30, 42 etc.,
54. 11.35: 12, 16, 28, 34, 39, 40 etc.,
55. 11.35: 22, 37, 88, 99 etc.

Another curious general correspondence between the two traditions, those of *Nālāyiram* and *Tirumuṟais,* in point of what is lacking, may be noticed here. In the Vaiṣṇavite literary traditions as a whole, we notice the absence of any substantial work of hagiology of an epic order and grandeur corresponding to Cēkkiḷār's *Periyapurāṇam* in the Saivite tradition. This rather regrettable lack in the Vaiṣṇavite tradition is in a sense matched by an equally sad lack in the other tradition, namely, the absence in the Śaivite literature of a body of commentary on the *Tirumuṟais* similar to the elaborate commentaries on the *Nālāyiram*, especially on *Tiruvāymoḷi* which have been made available in the Vaiṣṇavite tradition.

DR. SHRINARAYANA MISHRA

ORDER OF ENUMERATION OF THE VAIŚEṢIKA CATEGORIES

Attainment of salvation is the ultimate goal of all the branches of Indian Philosophy. Of course, difference of opinion, as it is bound to exist among scholars at least in some cases is there also about the nature of salvation, but it is not totally denied even by the materialist, least to say of others. This difference not withstanding, there is striking unanimity of opinion among most of the philosophical systems of india about the general principle that the direct realisation of the intrinsic nature of categories is the means for salvation, although they, depending on varying philosophical conceptions of their own, considerably differ from each other as to the number and nature of categories. Closely following this standing principle, also the Vaiśeṣika system of Kaṇāda puts in a new set of categories numbering six, namely substance, quality, action, genus universal, particularity and inherence. Non-existence or negation was later added as the seventh category. The direct realisation of the real nature of these categories is regarded to lead to salvation. For this purpose they have been duly enumerated, defined and some of them critically examined in the Vaiśeṣika literature.

Among the many aspects of treatment of number, nature and process of realisation of categories of the system significance is attached to the particular order in which the categories are to be enumerated.

The early Vaiśeṣika writer, Praśastapāda enumerates them in the following order; substance, quality, action, universal, particularity and inherence. This order has been maintained throughout the period of the history of the Vaiśeṣika literature. There must be some reason behind this.

Among the early Vaiśeṣika writers, like Praśastapāda, his commentators, namely Vyomaśiva, Śrīdhara, Udayana and Śrīvatsa, to whom all the Vaiśeṣika system owes much for its development for centuries, it is Śrīdharācārya alone that took up, perhaps for the first time, the problem and accordingly offered some logical explanations which in turn fructified in giving impetus to his successors to provide, at least in a few cases, some alternative or altogether different explanations.

1. SUBSTANCE:

As already stated, substance stands first in the order of enumeration. To justify its first enumeration Śrīdhara argues that it is enumerated first, because it is the substratum of all the categories.[1] Śaṅkara Miśra,[2] Mādhava Sarasvatī,[3] Jinavardhana Sūri,[4] Padmanābha Miśra,[5] Cinnam Bhaṭṭa,[6] Mādhavācārya[7] and Mallinātha[8] think in the same line.

Śaṅkara Miśra gives yet another reason. He argues that substance is mentioned first, because this alone is entitled to get salvation.[9] This argument may be taken to imply either that since substance alone is entitled to attain salvation, the most elevated metaphysical factor,[10] or that since substance claims the utmost importance in as much as this alone is entitled to get salvation in total exclusion of other categories, it is enumerated first.[11]

1. *ādau dravyasyoddeśaḥ, sarvāśrayatvena dravyasya prādhānyāt, Nyāyakandalī* (NK), p. 17, Varanasiya Sanskrit University, 1963.
2. *idānīm........sarvapadārthāśrayatayā ca prathamoddiṣṭasya dravyasya............ Vaiśeṣikasūtropaskāra* (VSU), I.i.5.
3. a. *dravyasya sarvapadārthādhāratvena................prādhānyāt prathamam uddeśaḥ, Mitabhāṣinī* (MB), pp. 14–15, Calcutta.
   b. *tatra sakalapadārthādhāratvāt..........dravyādīnām uddeśakramaḥ, Sarvadarśanakaumudī* (SDK), p. 6. Trivandrum, 1938.
4. *tatra sarveṣām ādhāratvenopajīvyatvāt pūrvaṃ dravyasyopanyāsaḥ, Jinavardhanī* (JV), p. 6. Ahmedabad, 1963.
5. *guṇādyāśrayatayā pradhānaṃ dravyam prathamam āha, Setu*, p. 35, Varanasi, 1931.
6. *samastapadārthāśrayatvena pradhānasya dravyasya prathamam uddeśaḥ, Tarkabhāṣāprakāśikā* (TBP), p. 208.
7. *samastapadārthāyatanatvena pradhānasya dravyasya prathamam uddeśaḥ, Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* (SDS), p. 84, Poona, 1928.
8. *iha sarvāśrayatvena prādhānyāt.................dravyādyuddeśakramaḥ, Niṣkaṇṭakā* (Nis) a commentary by Mallinātha on the *Tārkikarakṣā* of Varadarāja, p. 130, Varanasi, 1903.
9. *idānīm apavarga bhāgitayā........prathamoddiṣṭasya dravyasya*, VSU. I.i.5.
10. *prameyeṣu apavarga eva mūrdhābhiṣiktah, Tātparyaṭīkā*, p. 35, Chowkhamba 1925.
11. *pramāṇādiṣv api pradhānam prameyam, tatrāpy ātmatattvam, tadarthatvād itareṣām iti, Nyāvabhūṣaṇa*, p. 5, Varanasi, 1968.

No doubt, substance is entitled to attain salvation, but only in particular, namely the soul rather than in general. If this is to be admitted, why then has the soul not been enumerated first among the types of substance? This renders the above argument simply futile. Presumably this was the reason which compelled the learned author to take another course to repeat[12] Śrīdhara.

Now Mādhava Sarasvatī's arguments deserve examination. He proposes two arguments. The first is only what Śrīdhara gives.[13] The second argument is that substance is the inherent cause (*samavāyi-kāraṇa*) of all the effects.[14] Padmanābha Miśra too hints at latter explanations.[15] A careful consideration of this argument proves that it is a complex one as it would involve all the arguments for mentioning quality and action, the two heterogeneous effects of substance, before other categories, like universal particularity, etc. Besides, it fails to explain why eternal categories, like universal, etc., have not been enumerated first.

Even Śrīdhara's statement poses some problem, because ordinarily no substance can be considered to be the substratum of some of the catetories like *guṇatva* and *karmatva*. This is therefore, explained by some scholars[16] to mean that substance is, directly or indirectly, the substratum of all the categories. Others explain Śrīdhara's view by taking substance to be the substratum of all, on the ground that it possesses all those which are determined by any of the properties meant for dividing categories into six or seven.[17] Of these two views the latter is definitely better than the former, because its acceptance will render it totally impossible to repudiate the indirect substratumness even in quality. It is better to take that a substance is enumerated first because it is not the substratum of the absolute negation of all those which are determined by any of the properties constituting the very basis for dividing categories.

2. QUALITY:

Quality is second in enumeration. It succeeds substance and precedes action. Śrīdhara argues that it is enumerated next to substance, because in its varieties it exceeds action.[18] All the categories beginning with quality deserve their enumeration only after substance on which they depend because one can think of an attribute only after hav-

12. Vide fn. 2.
13. Vide fn. 3.
14. *dravyasya.........samavāyikāraṇatvena ca prādhānyāt prathamam uddeśaḥ*, M.B, pp. 14-15.
15. *guṇādikāraṇatayā prathamaṃ dravyanirūpaṇaṃ*, *Setu*, p. 51
16. Vāsudevaśāstri's Sanskrit commentary on SDS, p. 214, Poona, 1928.
17. Notes on the *Saptapadārthī*, p. 14. Calcutta.
18. *guṇānāṃ cā karmāpekṣayā bhūyastvād dravyānantaram abhidhānam*, NK, p. 17.

ing first conceived of its possessor.[19] The very dependence of quality on substance is considered a sufficient proof for deciding the succession of the former to the latter.

But being more (quantitatively) must not be taken to decide precedence or succession of a category, for this cannot explain why the *Viśeṣas* which are numerically larger have not been enumerated even before quality.

Hence his successors, Śaṅkara Miśra,[20] Mādhava Sarasvatī[21], Jina vardhana Sūri,[22] Cinnam Bhaṭṭa[23] and Mādhavācārya[24] explain that quality is placed immediately after substance for it (quality), in every form, inheres in all substances while action which has been given third place in the series does so only in the movable ones. Quality is related to substance more extensively, more intimately than action does. A negative statement in this context would better explain the cases of the effect substances at the moment of their production in so far as they are conceived to remain without any quality for that one moment (*utpannaṃ dravyaṃ ksaṇam aguṇaṃ niṣkriyaṃ ca tiṣṭhati*).

Śaṇkara Miśra[25] adds that the quality is manifested by and manifests the substance. This explanation, however, is not accurate for it applies to other categories too, particularly to action.

Mādhava Sarasvatī[26] explains that quality is produced immediately after the production of the substance while others do not do so. The basis for this view seems to be that inherence of quality gets manifested in substance in the moment immediately following that of production of latter. This basis shows that Universal would prove to be the most intimate with substance and therefore, it should have been enumerated even before quality. The defence however is available in that universal, despite of its being most intimate with substance, has been enumerated only next to action simply to obey the general principle *sati dharmiṇi dharmāḥ cintyante*. This is not a direct explanation and so Mādhava Sarasvatī states in his other work *Sarvadarśanakaumudī* that

19. *sati dharmiṇi dharmāś cintyante*
20. *guṇatvena rūpeṇa guṇānāṃ sarvadravyāśritatvāt - dravyānantaraṃ guṇānām uddeśam*, VSU. I. 1.6.
21. *guṇajātīyasya sarvadravyavṛttitvāt ...... guṇasya tadānantaryam*, MB. p. 15.
22. *tadanantaraṃ mūrtāmūrtadravyavṛttitvād guṇasya*, JV. p. 6.
23. *anantaraṃ guṇatvopādhinā sakaladravyavṛtter guṇasya*, TVP. p. 208.
24. *anantaraṃ guṇatvopādhinā sakaladravyavṛtter guṇasya*, SDS. p. 84.
25. *...... .....guṇānām ....dravyābhivyaṅgyatvaṃ dravyābhivyañjakatvaṃ ceti dravyānantaraṃ guṇānām uddeśam*, VSU. I. 6.
26. *guṇajātīyasya .... utpattyuttaram evotpannatvenātisānnidhyāc ca guṇasya tadānantaryam*, MB. p.15.

quality being the definitive attribute of substance is enumerated next to that.[27]

Padmanābha Miśra explains the precedence of the quality over action on the ground that it is one of the causes of the latter.[28]

3. ACTION:

Action is placed third in enumeration. Scholars have offered various explanations for this. Śrīdharācārya contends that since it invariably co-exists with quality it is enumerated immediately next to that,[29] but co-existence with quality is not a distinctive characteristic of action alone. Śaṅkara Miśra argues that because action is the product of both the substance and the quality and also because it is perceived only in such substances which have (manifest) colour. it is enumerated only after quality.[30] Out of these, the former explanation is better. Jinavardhana holds that action is enumerated after quality in as much as the former is diametrically opposed to the latter in the former inheres only in the moving substances while the latter in the unmoving ones too.[31] Mādhava Sarasvatī's explanation[32] is identical with that of Jina vardhana. The explanation for precedence of action to Universal consists in the fact that the former is one of the substrata of the latter.[33]

4. UNIVERSAL:

The universal comes next to action. For the justification of this, the following explanations are offered:

(i) that it is enumerated after substance, quality and action, because it inheres as an attribute in all the three,[34]

---

27. *dravyalakṣaṇatvena sannihitatvāt*, S.D.K. p. 5.

28. *tadanu karmamātrajanakatayā guṇasya, Setu*, p 51.

29. *niyamena guṇānuvidhāyitvāt karmaṇāṃ guṇānantaram uddeśaḥ*, N.K. p. 17

30. *karmaṇāṃ dravyajanyatayā guṇajanyatayā ca rūpi dravyasamavāyāc ca pratyakṣateti dravyaguṇābhidhānānantaraṃ karmoddeśavibhāgāv āha*, V.S.U. I. 1.7.

31. *tataś ca mūrtadravyamātravṛttitvāt karmaṇaḥ*, J.V. p. 6.

32. *Karmajātīyasya tadvaiparītyāt .... tadānantaryam*, M.B. p. 15.

33 *cf.* a) *karmajātīyasya jātyādhāratvāc ca tadānantaryam*, M.B. p. 15,
b) *idānīṃ sāmānyāśrayatayā sāmānyāt pūrvaṃ karmavibhāgamāha, setu*, p.51,
c) *tad anu sāmānyavattvasādharmyāt karmaṇaḥ*. TBP. p. 208,
d) *sāmānyavad upakramāt*, Nis,p. 130.

34. a) *Karmā(ntā) nvitatvāt sāmānyasya karmānantaram abhidhānam*, NK. p. 17,
b) *triṣv eva vartamānatvāt*, SDK. p. 5,
c) *trayādheyatvāt tadanu sāmānyasya*, JV. p. 6.
d) *paścāt tadāśritasya sāmānyasya*, TBP. p. 208,
e) *paścāt tritayāśritasya sāmānyasya*, SDS. p. 84.

(ii) that it is more extensive in its scope than particularity and inherence and therefore enumerated before them,[35]

(iii) that it is the basis of *anuvṛtti-pratyaya* (notion of identity) alone in contrast to particularity which constitutes the very ground of *vyāvṛtti-pratyaya* (notion of diffrence) only and hence placed before the latter[36] and

(iv) that it is the only perceivable category among the rest and therefore, enumerated first of all the rest.[37]

Among these four the second is rather confusing, for it is not known of *logical understanding*, how inherence, invariably co-existing with generic attribute, be regarded as a less extensive category than the latter. The third one too is equally illogical, because except *Para-sattā* or *para-sāmānya* all other Universals, technically known as *apara-sattās* effects both the *anuvṛtti-pratyaya* and the *vyāvṛtti-pratyaya* as well. So universal in general can in no way be regarded as opposed to particularity. There is some sense in the fourth but the first one is the most logical and acceptable one.

5. PARTICULARITY:

After universal particularity is enumerated, because it rests only in few substances and also for its being beyond the reach of the senses. It is enumerated before inherence which is found in all the five categories including particularity.[38] Mādhava Saraswatī explains the second argument as due to its relatedness to the universal.[39] The former argument is sound and therefore, acceptable.

---

35. a) *sāmānyasya............tritayagatatvena ca bahuviṣayatvāt tadānantaryam*, MB. p. 15,

b) *nissāmānyeṣu bahvāśrayatvāt*, Nis. p. 130.

36. *sāmānyasyānuvṛttatvena .... tadānantaryam*, MB. p. 15.

37. *idānīṃ sāmānyādiṣu triṣu pratyakṣasiddhatayā prathamaṃ sāmānyavibhāgam āha* .*Setu*, p. 53.

38. (a) *pañcapadārthavṛtteḥ samavāyasya sarvaśeṣeṇābhidhāne prāpte viśeṣāṇām madhye kathanam*, NK. p. 17,

(b) *viśeṣasya samavetatvāt ... tadānantaryam*, MB. p. 15,

(c) *samavāyavatāṃ sarveṣāṃ saṅkalanārthaṃ viśeṣāṇām*, JV. p. 6,

(d) *tadanantaram samavāyāśrayasya viśeṣasya*, TBP. 208,

(e) *sāmānyāntān samavāyino nirūpya samavāyitayā samavāyāt pūrvaṃ viśeṣam lakṣayati*, *Setu*, p. 56,

(f) *samavāyyupakramāt*, Nis. p. 130,

(g) *tadanantaraṃ samavāyādhikaraṇasya viśeṣasya*, SDS. p. 84.

39. (a) *viśeṣasya .. .. sāmānyāpratiyogitvāc ca tadānantaryam*, MB. p. 15,

(b) *sāmānyapratiyogitvāt*, SDK. p. 5.

6. INHERENCE :

Inherence is the last enumerated positive category it is natural to count it at the end[40] after all the categories which are its substrata.

7. NEGATION :

Negation comes last in the whole series. Although it is not enumerated by earlier writers as a category to be realized for attaining salvation, the later writers admit it.[41] Its mention at the end is due to its invariable dependence upon the positive categories[42].

From the above account it is clear that the Vaiśeṣika writers have been very careful in accounting for the enumeration of the categories in such a logical order.

40. (a) *pañcapadārthavṛtteḥ samavāyasya sarvaśeṣeṇābhidhāne prāpte*, NK. p. 17,
(b) *eteṣām pañcānaṃ sambandhatvena samavāyasya*, MB. p. 15,
(c) *tadanantaram pūrvokteṣu pañcasu samavāyo vartate iti sūcayituṃ samavāyasya* ...., JV. p. 6,
(d) *idānīṃ kramaprāptaṃ samavāyam āha*, *Setu*, p. 51,
(e) *ante samavāyasyeti* ...., TBP. p. 208,
(f) *ante' vaśiṣṭasya samvāyasyeti* ...., SDS. p. 84,
(g) *taccheṣatvāc ca* ...., Nis. p. 130.

41. This problem is dealt with in detail by the author in a separate paper 'Concept of Negation as a separate category in the Vaiśeṣika system', *Kaviśekhara felicitation vol.*, Allahabad

42. (a) *ṣaṇṇāṃ niṣedha rūpatvena abhāvasya tadānantaryam*, MB. p. 15,
(b) *tadanu avaśiṣṭasyābhāvasya* ...., JV. p. 6.

Dr. M.D. PARADKAR

ŚIVARĀMA, THE COMMENTATOR OF THE DAŚAKUMĀRACARITA

Śivarāma is known as the author of the *Bhūṣaṇa* or *Bhūṣaṇā*, a commentary on the eight *Ucchvāsas* of Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita* excluding the *Pūrva* as well as the *Uttara-pīṭhikā*. This commentary along with the *Padacandrikā* of the celebrated Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī was edited by N.G. Godbole and K.P. Parab for the Nirṇayasāgar Press, Bombay in 1883.

Regarding the date and home of Śivarāma much is not known beyond the information that he himself has given in this commentary. He appears to be a devotee of Śaṅkara in so far as he starts with a salutation to him in the words :

aparṇayā haimavatyā yuktaḥ sthāṇuḥ prasīdatu /
sarvatāpapraśamanaḥ sarvābhīṣṭaphalapradaḥ //

i.e., 'Let Sthāṇu accompanied by Aparṇā, the daughter of Himavat, the cause of removing all difficulties and the giver of all heart-cherished desires, confer favour (on us)'. The fact that Śaṅkara was his favourite deity is also corroborated by the introductory verse of his commentary on the drama *Tapatī-saṃvaraṇa* of Kulaśekharavarman which offers a salutation to Candracūḍa.[1] In this commentary named *Bhūṣaṇā*, he further informs us that his grandfather Trilokacandra distinguished himself as a lustrous Brahmin (*mahaujāḥ dvijāgryaḥ*), devotee of Śaṅkara (*maheśapādāmbujasaktacetāḥ*) and commended respect from the king of the country (*nareśa-sampūjitapādapadmaḥ*). Kṛṣṇarāma the son of this repository of bliss, gave birth to four among whom he, i.e., Śivarāma, was the eldest. The verse

govindarāmo 'tha mukundarāmo jātaḥ kramāt keśavarāmasaṃjñaḥ /
karomi ṭīkāṃ nijabandhuvargamude manojñāṃ śivarāmasaṃjñaḥ //

1. *praṇipatya candracūḍaṃ śrīmatkulaśekharāvanīndrakṛtam /*
tapatīsaṃvaraṇākhyaṃ nāṭakam adhikṛtya vivaraṇaṃ kriyate //

not only gives the names of his three brothers in due order but also adds the detail that the commentary *Bhūṣaṇā* was primarily written with the purpose of enlightening them. Aufrecht in his Catalogous Catalogorum (vol. I, p. 652) gives Tripāṭhin as his surname and says that 'he quotes the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* in the *Lakṣmīvilāsa*, which suffices to place him in the beginning of the eighteenth century'. This *Lakṣmīvilāsa* probably refers to his commentary on the work *Nakṣatramālā* wrongly attributed to him.

Coming to the works of our author, Aufrecht has referred to as many as ten, namely (i) *Kāñcanadarpaṇa - Vāsavadattāṭīkā*, (ii) *Kādambarīṭīkā*, (iii) *Kāvyalakṣmīprakāśa*, (iv) *Daśakumāracaritabhāṣya*, (v) *Nakṣatramālā* with its commentary *Lakṣmīvilāsa*, (vi) *Bhūpālabhūṣaṇa*, (vii) *Rasaratnahāra*, (viii) *Lakṣmīnivāsābhidhāna - Uṇādikośa*, (ix) *Vidyāvilāsa* and (x) *Viṣamapadī-Kāvyaprakāśaṭīkā*. Among these, the *Nakṣatramālā* (p. 185, *l.* 15),[2] and *Rasaratnahāra* (p. 188, *l.* 27, p. 200, *l.* 11) are actually quoted in the *Bhūṣaṇā*, the commentary without any such word as *mama* or *asmadīya*. Hence they do not appear to be the works of this Sivarāma. The words *yad atra vaktavyaṃ taduktaṃ vāsavadattādarpaṇe* (p. 204, *l.* 7) in this commentary however, go to prove the authorship of the *Vāsavadattādarpaṇa* which is possibly identical with *Kāñcanadarpaṇa-Vāsavadattāṭīkā* referred to by Aufrecht. The *Daśakumāracarita bhāṣya* has not come to light; it seems to be an alternative title of this commentary known by the name *Bhūṣaṇā* which is however, too brief to be called *bhāṣya*. Among other works, Commentaries on the *Kāvyaprakāśa* namely *Viṣamapadī* and *Kādambarī* can be easily attributed to our author. Another work of his, namely a commentary on the drama the *Subhadrā-dhanañjaya* of Kulaśekharavarman has also been referred to by T. Gaṇapatiśāstri in his edition of the *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇa* published in Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. XI in the year 1911.

The fact that our author belongs to comparatively a very late date is also corroborated by his commentary on the Daśakumāra *carita* where late lexicons like *Anekārthamañjarī*, *Viśva*, *Viśvaprakāśa*, *Vaijayantī*, *Halāyudha* and *Haima* along with lexicographers such as Ajaya, Divākara, Bhāguri and Hemacandra are profusely quoted.

As has been already stated, very little is known about the personal life of our author. It is, however, possible to say that he must have resided, in Mahārāṣṭra for a very long time as the *Bhūṣaṇā* offers linguistic evidence to indicate his close acquaintance with Marāṭhi. It is interesting to find explanations of many Sanskrit words with their equivalents in *bhāṣā*, i.e., spoken language and a majority of these words are

2. References are to the N.S.P. edition of the *Daśakumāracaritam* of Daṇḍin with the commentaries *Padacandrikā* and *Bhūṣaṇā* brought out by N.G. Godbole and K.P. Parab, 1883.

commonly used in colloquial Marāṭhi. Thus *nakhara* is explained as *nāṅk iti bhāṣayā* (p. 180, *l.* 7), *lohastambha* as *lohobandā iti bhāṣayā* (p. 180, *l.* 27), and *karṇikāra* as *kaṭhacampā iti bhāṣāyām* (p. 181, *l.* 4). The same is true of *upahārakarma* paraphrased by *sāñjhī iti bhāṣāyām* (p. 184, *l.* 6), *pravahaṇam* by *tāṅgā iti bhāṣayā* (p. 184, *l.* 24), *phaṇimukham* by *savarī iti bhāṣāyām* (p. 186, *l.* 14) and *kṣīrasāgara* by *Sirodaka iti bhāṣāyām prasiddham* (p. 199, *l.* 13). Explanations of some other words in this commentary are more eloquent than these. Meanings of words like *saṃdaṃśakam dīpikā* or *hastadīpa*, *alindabhūmi* are brought home to the reader by paraphrasing them with *sāṇḍasī it bhāṣāyām* (p. 186, *l.* 17), *maśāla iti bhāṣāyām* (p. 187, *l.* 3) and *oṃṭā iti bhāṣayā prasiddham* (p. 193, *l.* 1) respectively. Is it not significant to note that our author paraphrases *bhṛṅgāra* by *jhārī* (p. 195, *l.* 9), *upahastikā* by *caṃcvī* (p. 201, *l.* 1)? Words like *savarī*, *sāṇḍasi*, *maśāl*, *oṃṭā*, *jhārī* and *caṃcvī* (i.e., *caṃcī*) cannot be called literary in character; they are used in common parlance in villages and towns of Mahārāṣṭra. They cannot be used by a person who is not acquainted with spoken or colloquial Marathi. Words of our author such as *bhāṣayā vakolapadavācyāḥ* (p. 208, *l.* 16), in explaining the term *madhyasthāyināḥ* and *nāgarikabalaṃ nagararakṣākartur bhāṣayā kōtvāl ity ākhyāyaḥ balaṃ sainyam.* (p. 187, *l.* 45) can also be offered as an additional evidence to show his acquaintance with Marāṭhi. Thus on the basis of the use of many colloquial words in Marathi, the author of the *Bhūṣaṇā* or *Bhūṣaṇa* can safely be said to have been a resident of Mahārāṣṭra.

Dr. P.S.R. APPA RAO

MĀNAVALLI RĀMAKRISHNA KAVI

Sri Mānavalli Rāmakrishna Kavi, famously referred to as M.R. Kavi, was born on the 20th of March, 1875 at Nuṅgambākkam in Madras. He came of a learned brahmin family. His grandfather, Sri Venkata Kuppa Śāstri was a great sanskrit scholar. Sri M R. Kavi's father Sri Rāma Śāstri was a noted puritan and was proficient in eighteen languages and several branches of learning; a connoisseur and a commentator on the *Nāṭyaśāstra.* His (elder) brother Tyāgarāja also was a scholar. He had a very great affection for his brother Rāmakrishna Kavi.

Sri Kavi was first a graduate of the Christian College, Madras and after sometime obtained his post-graduate degrees in Telugu and Sanskrit from the University of Madras. As a student he published essays on Telugu literature, which laid foundations for the future researchers in the field. Around the age of 15 or 16 years, he composed the *Mṛgāvati*, a Telugu poem and dedicated it to his brother Tyāgarāja. This was first published in the Journal *Vaijayanti* in 1890 and later as a book in the year 1897. It was just this composition that brought him the title *kavi* and thus he came to be known as M.R. Kavi.

The following are some of the original works of M.R. Kavi: The *Pāṭalīputramu* (poetry), *Kaliṅgaśenamu* (a *prakaraṇa*), *Mahāvīruḍu*, *Vatsarājacarita* and *Vasantavilāsamu.* The *Vasantavilāsamu* is not yet published. It can be said that Sri Kavi was the first to translate Bhāsa's dramas like the *Karṇabhāra* into Telugu. Kavi wanted to prepare a treatise on grammar based on the language of the *Kumārasambhava* of Nannecōḍa and wrote about 22 *sūtras* in this direction.

Sri Kavi after his graduation worked as D P.I. in the Vanaparti Saṃsthānam in Telaṅgāṇa where he shaped himself into a well disciplined researcher. He started the collection of Manuscripts (palmleaf) and rock edicts. During this period he published a number of books

under the general caption *Vismṛtakavulu* (forgotten poets). The first in these series is the *Krīḍābhirāmamu* of Vallabharāya (1909). In the introduction of this work he established that the author of this work is Vallabharāya and not Śrīnātha.

The *Kumārasambhava* of Nannecōḍa was the second in the series of *Vismṛtakavulu.* The first part of this work was published in 1909 with an elaborate introduction in which the Kavi established that Nannecōḍa was senior to Nannaya so for considered to be the first Telugu poet. This created a great stir in the Telugu literary field but the Kavi unmindful of this tumultuous breeze, publsihed the second part of this work in 1914. The following are a few other works published by the Kavi under the caption *Vismṛtakavulu* – The *Prabandhamaṇibhūṣaṇamu* (1910), *Tripurāntakodāharaṇamu, Nīti (śastra) muktāvali (Baddena nīti), Āndhra-tiruvāyimozi, Śrīraṅgamāhātmyamu; Sakalanītisammatamu.* While working at Vanaparti, the Kavi toured Telaṅgāṇa, collecting *śāsanas* which were published under the caption the *Historic Records of Hyderabad State.*

After leaving Vanaparti, he worked as Lecturer in Sanskrit in the Pacchayyappa's College, Madras. At this time the Government of Madras appointed a few scholars to carry out the task of collecting old MSS. with the Kavi as one of the members. He was then associating himself with the great pandit S.K. Rāmanātha Śāstri. These two toured extensively the whole of Andhra, Tamil, Mysore and Kerala States and acquired many valuable works like Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra, Abhinava-bhārati* of Abhinavagupta, *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* of Bhoja, *Vivaraṇa* of *yoga-bhāṣya* and several dramas. The search for the old MSS. went on for six to seven years.

In association with Sri Rāmanātha Śāstri as a joint editor, Sri Kavi began publishing the Sanskrit works under the title *Dakṣiṇabhārati.* The *Caturbhāṇi* is the first in his series (1922). The publications like the *Kundamālā* (1923), *Avantisundarīkathā* (1924), *Vatsarājacarita* of Śūdraka, *Kaumudīmahotṣava* of Vijjikādevī (1929) brought him international fame.

After the Government of Madras stopped this programme, the Kavi left for Rajahmundry to take up the post as Lecturer in the Training College. This proved to be really a glorious period in his life. Under the compulsion of Sri K.P. Jayaswal, he had to undertake the responsibility of editing the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata with the commentary of Abhinavagupta for the Gaekwad's Oriental Series of Baroda. Both the text and the commentary were saturated with mistakes and interpolations. The Kavi himself commented that it would not be possible for Bharata, and Abhinavagupta to identify their respective texts even if

they were to come down from heavens. Despite such a complexity the Kavi undertook the task and brought out the first part of the work (the first seven chapters) in 1926. Out of the remaining three parts, only two parts were completed and brought out during the life period of the Kavi. It can be said that this edition of *Nāṭyaśāstra* earned international fame for him.

In 1926 the Kavi joined the T.T. Devasthanams, Tirupati, as the Educational Officer. Here he published many valuable articles in Journals such as the *Venkateswara Journal.* His essays published in the *Bhārati* under the title *Puṣpāñjali* proved to be original and illuminating.

In 1935 the Kavi was appointed as an Examiner of the Macanzy Local Records in the History Department of the University of Madras. He strived much to translate them into English. This project continued for about six years. At this stage the T.T. Devasthanams, Tirupati, started an Oriental Research Institute and the Kavi was appointed Reader in the Institute. He worked here for a period of ten years the last active part of his literary life.

During his service in S.V. Oriental Institute, at the age of 69, the Kavi brought out the famous work *Bharatakośa.* This work which was published in 1951 by the T.T. Devasthanams, Tirupati became his *magnum opus.*

The Kavi was the poineer having started research in the field of Telugu literature. Great scholars like Kandukūri Vīrēsaliṅgam and Vētūri Prabhākaraśāstri spoke very high of the Kavi. In the field of Sanskrit literature, Sri K.P. Jayaswal compared him to a light house and said that he was an Institute by himself.

The Kavi was favoured by Sarasvatī only (Goddess of Learning) but not Lakṣmī (Goddess of Wealth). But his poverty did not stand in the way of his literary pursuits. In his latter life he lost hold on himself, with the demise of his eldest son Dorasvāmi Ayya who was himself a good scholar and rendered assistance to the father. The demise of his eldest son-in-law also came as shock to him. His wife left this world long ago. He was reduced to nothing in the last five or six years of his life. At this stage the Andhra and Central Governments sanctioned to him a monthly pension of Rs. 150/-. But the Kavi could enjoy it only for a few months. He breathed his last on the night of the 20th of September, 1957.

Though he was Sarasvatī incarnate, he was extremely unassuming and humble. He dedicated all his life to research only.

REVIEWS

A CHECK-LIST OF SANSKRIT MEDICAL MANUSCRIPTS IN INDIA

Compiled by – B. RAMA RAO, G.C.A.M., M A.

Published for the Central Council for Research In Indian Medicine and Homeopathy, New Delhi, 1972.

Price : Rs. 10/–

The work contains a list of the Medical Manuscripts available with a few Manuscript Libraries and Oriental Research Institutes. This alphabetical check-list gives the name of text and the libraries where it is found with its call number etc., as a ready reference. It also gives the alternative title of the book if any. Dr. Raghavan in his foreword advocates the necessity for a descriptive catalogue of such works to which the present 'check-list' forms a nucleus.

Dr. D.V. Subba Reddy in his introduction has clearly explained the purpose and utility of a work of this type. The time and pains taken by Dr. Reddy to give a shape to his long cherished desire in the interest of our culture and knowledge is commendable. The work, no doubt, is a stepping-stone for the researchers who try to establish and revive the glory of Indian Medicine.

In course of time, we hope that Dr. Reddy will be able to bring out a comprehensive Descriptive Catalogue of these works adding the material gathered after the publication of this to give higher benefits to the scholars.

The interest exhibited by Dr. Rama Rao in compiling this work is praiseworthy.

K.S. RAMAMURTI

N.S. RAMANUJA TATACHARYA

उणादिप्रकरणं पाणिनीयव्याकरणं च

पञ्चपाद्यात्मना दशपाद्यात्मना च सांप्रतमुपलभ्यमानस्य उणादिप्रकरणस्य पाणिनीयव्याकरणस्य च संनिहितः संबन्धो वर्तते, यतः उभयत्राप्यनुबन्धादि (इत्संज्ञादि) कार्याणि समानानि वर्तन्ते। तत्र उणादिप्रकरणकर्तृविषये उणादीनां व्युत्पत्त्यव्युत्पत्तिविषये अन्यत्र च प्राचीनानां वैयाकरणानाम् आधुनिकानां विमर्शकानां च महान् मतभेदः अवलोक्यते। अतो मध्यस्थदृष्ट्या सर्वमपि नानाग्रन्थालोडनपूर्वकं पर्यालोचितवतामस्माकं यो निर्णयविशेषो लब्धस्तमत्र विदुषां पुरत उपस्थापयामः।

उणादिप्रकरणस्य कर्ता

उणादिसूत्राणां प्रणेता न पाणिनिः अपि तु शाकटायन एवेति प्राक्तनग्रन्थेभ्योऽवसीयते। तथा हि –

1. 'उणादयो बहुलम्' (पा. सू. 3-3-1) इति सूत्रे बहुलग्रहणप्रयोजनविचारावसरे 'बहुलवचनं किमर्थम्' इति भाष्यम्। तस्य च 'उणादय इत्येव सूत्रमुणादीनां शास्त्रान्तरपठितानां साधुत्वाभ्यनुज्ञानार्थमस्त्विति भावः' इति कैयटः व्याख्यानं कृतवान्। अत्र 'शास्त्रान्तर पठितानां' इति वदन् कैयटः उणादिप्रकरणं न पाणिनीयम्, अपि तु पाणिनीयान्यव्याकरणसंबन्धीति स्पष्टं सूचयति।

2. अस्तु व्याकरणान्तरसंबन्धीनि तानि सूत्राणीति, तथापि तानि शाकटायनप्रणीतानीति कथं सिध्यतीति चेत् – इत्थम्। 'व्याकरणे शकटस्य च तोकम्' इति वार्तिकेन, 'वैयाकरणानां च शाकटायन आह धातुजं नामेति' इति तद्भाष्येण च सर्वेषां नामशब्दानां धातुतः उत्पत्तिः शाकटायननामकवैयाकरणसंमतेति

ज्ञायते । उणादिप्रकरणमेव नाम्नां धातुजत्वं प्रतिपादयति । नान्यत् किमपि व्याकरणं नाम्नां धातुजत्वं प्रतिपादयत् वयमुपलभामहे । तेन मन्यामहे धातुजतया नामनिष्पादकमुणादिप्रकरणं शाकटायननिर्मितमिति भाष्यवार्तिककारौ संमन्येते इति ।

3. अत एव नागेशेन प्रदीपोद्योते – 'एवं च कृवापा इत्याद्युणादिसूत्राणि शाकटायनस्येति सूचितम्' इत्यभ्यधायि ।

4. वासुदेवदीक्षित: सिद्धान्तकौमुदीव्याख्यायां बालमनोरमायां लिखति – 'तानि चेमानि सूत्राणि शाकटायनप्रणीतानि, न तु पाणिनिना' इति ।

5. पञ्चपाद्युणादिवृत्तिकार: श्वेतवनवासी च ब्रूते – 'येयं शाकटायनादिभि: पञ्चपादी रचिता' इति । अत्र आदिपदं प्रयुञ्जानोऽयं सांप्रतमुपलभ्यमानानि सर्वाण्युणादिसूत्राणि न शाकटायनमुनिना प्रणीतानि, अपि तु कानिचित् शाकटायनेन रचितानि, अन्यानि तु अनन्तरकालिकै: निर्माय संयोजितानीति स्वमतमभिव्यनक्ति । इदमेव मतं सिद्धान्ततया अग्रे स्थापयिष्याम: ।

उणादिप्रकरणस्य कर्ता पाणिनिरिति मतम्

1. उणादिसूत्राणि कानिचित् पाणिनिरेव विरचय्य सकलनामशब्दनिर्वचनपरसूत्राणामानन्त्येन प्रणयनासंभवं मन्यमान: 'उणादयो बहुलम्' इति सूत्रयामासेति केचन विमर्शका मन्यन्ते । अत एव नारायणभट्ट: पञ्चपादीस्थस्य 'मकुरदर्दुरौ' (उ. सू. 1–40) इति सूत्रस्य व्याख्यानावसरे –

'अकारं मकुरस्यादौ उकारं दर्दुरस्य च ।
बभाण पाणिनिस्तौ तु व्यत्ययेनाह भोजराट् ॥'

इत्याह । 'पाणिनिर्बभाण' इति कथयन् 'मकुरदर्दुरौ' इत्युणादिसूत्रं पाणिनिकर्तृकं मन्यते नारायणभट्ट: ।

2. तथा शिशुपालवधस्य रचयिता माघकवि: –
'निपातितसुहृत्स्वामिपितृव्यभ्रातृमातुलम् ।
पाणिनीयमिवालोचि धीरैस्तत्समराजिरम् ॥'

इत्यभाणीत् । अस्मिन् श्लोके सुहृत्, स्वामिन्, पितृव्य, भ्रातृ, मातुल एते शब्दा: पाणिनिना निपातिता: इति माघकवि: कथयति । एतेषु शब्देषु भ्रातृशब्द: उणादि-

सूत्रेणैव निपातितः न पाणिनिना। तथा च उणादिसूत्रनिपातितं शब्दं पाणिनिनिपातितं कथयन् माघकविः उणादिसूत्राणां रचयिता पाणिनिरिति ध्वनयति।

3. हरिदीक्षितविरचिते बृहच्छब्दरत्ने अचिरात् पुण्यपत्तनतः प्रकाशमुपगते — 'वर्णसमाम्नायस्तु महेश्वरेण प्रोक्तः। केचित्तु पाणिनिप्रणीत एव, उणादिपाठवन्नाष्टाध्याय्यामन्तर्भावः। माहेश्वराणीत्यत्र आगतार्थे लब्धार्थे वा तद्धित इत्याहुः' इति वाक्यान्युपलभ्यन्ते। तेन अष्टाध्याय्यनन्तर्गततया उणादिप्रकरणं पाणिनिनैव निर्मितमिति कश्चन प्रवादः प्राक्काल एव आसीदिति अवगच्छामः।

अत्र निर्णयः

तत्र तत्र उणादिसूत्राणां काशिकायां भाष्यप्रदीपादौ चोद्धरणात् पाणिनिसूत्रेष्वपि 'थाथघञ्क्ताजबित्रकाणाम्' (पा. सू. 6-2-144) 'अयामन्ताल्वाय्येत्न्विष्णुषु' (पा. सू. 6-4-55) 'इस्मन्त्रन्क्विषु च' (पा. सू. 6-4-97) 'तितुत्रतथसिसुसरकसेषु च' (पा. सू. 7-2-9) 'जाग्रोऽविचिण्णल्ङित्सु' (पा. सू. 7-3-85) इत्यादिषु 'अथ, आय्य, इस्, वि, सर' इत्यादीनामौणादिकप्रत्ययानां निर्दिष्टत्वात् पाणिनेः पूर्वमेव उणादिसूत्राण्यासन्। तानि च 'नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते' इति महाभाष्यवचनात् तदुद्धृतयास्कनिरुक्तवचनाच्च शाकटायनकर्तृकाण्येव। परं तु न सर्वाण्युणादिसूत्राणि इदानीं दृश्यमानानि शाकटायनकर्तृकाणीति शक्यते वक्तुम्। कानिचित् पाणिनीयव्याकरणानन्तरं निर्मितानीति अवगमे लिङ्गानां सद्भावात्। तथा हि —

1. 'मृजेर्गुणश्च' (उ. सू. 1-82) इत्युणादिसूत्रम्। अनेन मृजधातोः ऊप्रत्ययो विधीयते। अत्र 'मृजेर्वृद्धिः' (पा. सू. 7-2-114) इति पाणिनिसूत्रेण वृद्धौ प्राप्तायां तदपवादतया गुणोऽपि विधीयते। अनेनेदं स्पष्टं भवति, यदिदं सूत्रं पाणिनेरनन्तरकालिकमिति। कथमन्यथा पाणिनिविहितवृद्ध्यपवादं गुणं विदधीत।

2. तथा 'अमन्ताड्डः' (उ. सू. 1-111) इति सूत्रं पाणिनीयव्याकरणान्तर्गतं 'अम्' इति प्रत्याहारं निर्दिशत् आत्मानं तदनन्तरकालिकं ज्ञापयति।

3. 'अजेरज च' (उ. सू. 2-50) इत्युणादिसूत्रं अजधातोः इनच्प्रत्ययं अजेरजादेशं च विधत्ते। अत्र अजेरजादेशविधानं व्यर्थमित्याशङ्कां समाधातुं 'वीभावबाधनार्थम्' इति भट्टोजी प्रोक्तवान्। एतेन 'अजेर्व्यघञपोः' (पा.सू. 2-4-56) इति

पाणिनिसूत्रेण प्राप्तस्य अजेः वी इत्यादेशस्य बाधनार्थमजादेशो विहित इति ज्ञायते। तथा चास्य सूत्रस्य पाणिन्यनन्तरकालिकत्वं स्पष्टम्।

4. तथा 'च्विरव्ययम्' (उ. सू. 2-67) इत्युणादिसूत्रम्। डौप्रत्ययान्तं शब्दस्वरूपं च्व्यन्तं चेत् अव्ययसंज्ञकं स्यादिति तदर्थः। ग्लौकरोति इत्युदाहरणम्। अत्र ग्लौ इत्यस्य एजन्तकृदन्तत्वात् 'कृन्मेजन्तः' (पा. सू. 1-1-39) इति पाणिनिसूत्रेणैवाव्ययत्वे सिद्धे इदमुणादिसूत्रं किमर्थमिति शङ्का अवतरति। अत्र भट्टोजी ब्रवीति – 'कृन्मेजन्त इति सिद्धे नियमार्थमिदम्। उणादिप्रत्ययान्तश्च्व्यन्त एवेति' इति। अनेनापि स्पष्टीभवति यदिदं सूत्रं पाणिनेरनन्तरकालिकमिति।

5. तथा 'गतिकारकोपपदयोः पूर्वपदप्रकृतिस्वरत्वं च' (उ. सू. 4-227) इत्युणादिसूत्रेण गतौ कारके चोपपदे धातोरसिः प्रत्ययः पूर्वपदस्य प्रकृतिस्वरश्च विधीयेते। अत्र 'पूर्वपदप्रकृतिस्वरत्वं च' इत्यनुक्तौ 'गतिकारकोपपदात्कृत्' (पा. सू. 6-2-139) इति पाणिनिसूत्रेण उत्तरपदप्रकृतिस्वरत्वं प्राप्नुयात्। तद्बाधनार्थं तथोक्तमिति स्पष्टम्। एवं च पाणिनिसूत्रापवादभूतमिदं सूत्रं तदनन्तरकालिकमिति स्पष्टम्।

6. तथा 'जीर्यतेः क्रिन् रश्च वः' (उ. सू. 5-49) इत्युणादिसूत्रम्। अनेन च जॄधातोः क्रिन्प्रत्ययो विधीयते। 'रश्च वः' इति भागः अवधानार्हः। जॄ+रि इति स्थिते 'ॠत इद्धातोः' (पा. सू. 7-1-100) इति पाणिनिसूत्रेण ॠकारस्य इकारे 'उरण् रपरः' (पा. सू. 1-1-59) इत्यनेन रपरे सति जिर्+रि इति स्थिते रेफस्य वकारो विधीयते जिव्रिः इति रूपम्। अनेनापि ज्ञायते यदिदं सूत्रं पाणिनिसूत्रकटाक्षेण प्रवृत्तमिति।

7. एवमाधुनिकाः 'दीनारः' इत्यादयः शब्दा अपि उणादिसूत्रेषु व्युत्पाद्यन्ते। तेन तादृशानि सूत्राणि पश्चात्कालिकानीति ऊहितुमस्त्यवकाशः।

उणादीनां व्युत्पत्त्यव्युत्पत्तिपक्षौ

महाभाष्यकारो बहुषु स्थलेषु उणादिनिष्पादितानि नामानि प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागरहितानि अव्युत्पन्नानीति कथयति। तानि च भाष्याणि सूत्रसंख्यासहितानि अधस्तान्निर्दिश्यन्ते –

1. यथासादृश्ये (पा. सू. 2-1-7)

भाष्यम् – नैष दोषः । अयं यथाशब्दोऽस्त्येवाव्युत्पन्नः प्रातिपदिकं वीप्सावाचि । अस्ति प्रकारवचने थाल् । तत्र यदव्युत्पन्नं प्रातिपदिकं वीप्सावाचि तस्येदं ग्रहणम् ।

प्रदीपः – अर्थवत्सूत्रारम्भादव्युत्पन्नानामपि संभवोऽवगम्यते ।

2. लस्य (पा. सू. 3-4-77)

भाष्यम् – एवमपि शाला माला मल्ल इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति । उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि ।

3. ङ्याप्प्रातिपदिकात् (पा. सू. 4-1-1)

भाष्यम् – एवमप्युकारसकारयोः प्रसज्येत । कमेः सः कंसः । परान् शृणातीति परशुरिति । उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि ।

4. वनो रच (पा. सू. 4-1-7)

भाष्यम् – एवमपि मघोनी अत्र प्राप्नोति । मघवच्छब्दोऽव्युत्पन्नं प्रातिपदिकम् ।

प्रदीपः – श्वन्नुक्षन्नित्यौणादिको मघवन्शब्दः । उणादिषु च नावश्यं व्युत्पत्तिनिमित्तं कार्यं भवति ।

5. पङ्क्तिविंशति – (पा. सू. 5-1-59)

भाष्यम् – अनारम्भो वा पुनर्विंशत्यादीनां न्याय्यः । कथं सिध्यति ? 'प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानात्' । कथं प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानम् ? विंशत्यादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि ।

6. धातोः (पा. सू. 6-1-162)

भाष्यम् - अवश्यं सनो विशेषणार्थो नकारः कर्तव्यः । क्व विशेषणार्थेनार्थः ? सन्यङोरिति । सन्यङोरितीयत्युच्यमाने हंसः वत्सः अत्रापि प्राप्नोति । अर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्येत्येवं न भविष्यति । कथमानर्थक्यम् ? उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि ।

7. असिद्धवदत्राभात् (सू. 6-4-22)

भाष्यम् – नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्। वक्ष्यत्येतत् मघवन्शब्दोऽव्युत्पन्नं प्रातिपदिकमिति।

8. आयनेयी (पा. सू. 7-1-2)

भाष्यम् – प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च भगवतः पाणिनेराचार्यस्य सिद्धम्, उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि।

9. नेड्वशि कृति (पा. सू. 7-2-8)

भाष्यम् – अथान्ये ये वशादयस्तत्र कथम्? उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि।

10 केऽणः (पा. सू. 7-4-13)

भाष्यम् – केऽणो ह्रस्वत्वे तद्धितग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। किं प्रयोजनम्? कृन्निवृत्त्यर्थम्। कृति मा भूत् राका धाकेति। तत्त्वर्हि वक्तव्यम्। न वक्तव्यम्। उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि।

11. उपधायां च (पा. सू. 8-2-78)

भाष्यम् – उणादिप्रतिषेधो वक्तव्य इति। परिहृतमेतत् उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानीति।

12. नित्यं समासेऽनुत्तरपदस्थस्य (पा. सू. 8-3-45)

भाष्यम् – अथाव्युत्पन्नं प्रातिपदिकम्, ततो नित्ये षत्वे प्राप्ते इयं विभाषा आरभ्यते।

13. आदेशप्रत्ययोः (पा. सू. 8-3-59)

भाष्यम् – आदेशप्रत्यययोः षत्वे सरकः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः कुसरः धूसर इति। अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते सरक इति। सरगादीनामिति वक्तव्यम्। इहापि यथा स्यात् वर्सं तर्समिति। तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम्। न वक्तव्यम्। उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि।

14. ठस्येकः (पा. सू. 7-3-50)

भाष्यम् – उणादीनां तावत् प्रतिषेधो न वक्तव्यः। परिहृतमेतत् उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि इति।

एतेषां भाष्यसंदर्भाणामवलोकनेन उणादिनिष्पादिताः शब्दाः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागरहिताः अव्युत्पन्ना इति भगवतः पतञ्जलेरभिप्राय इति प्रतीयते। परं तु मध्यस्थदृष्ट्या पर्यालोचने अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष एव उणादिषु भाष्यसंमत इति न शक्यते वक्तुम्। तथा सति सर्पिषा यजुषा इत्यादौ षत्वस्य दुर्लभत्वात्। अत्र हि सकारस्य 'आदेशप्रत्यययोः' (पा. सू. 8-3-59) इति सूत्रेण षत्वं वक्तव्यम्। व्युत्पत्तिपक्ष एव प्रत्ययावयवत्वमाश्रित्य षत्वं भवितुमर्हति। अत एव भाष्य एवेमां शङ्कामुद्भाव्य व्युत्पत्तिपक्षमाश्रित्य षत्वं समसाधि। तथा हि 'आदेशप्रत्यययोः' इति सूत्रे भाष्यम् –

> 'न वा एतत् षत्वे शक्यं विज्ञातुम् उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि
> प्रातिपदिकानीति। इह हि न स्यात् सर्पिषः यजुष इति।
> एवं तर्हि बहुलं प्रत्ययसंज्ञा भवति' इति।
> कैयटश्च – 'षत्वं व्युत्पत्तिहेतुकमुणादीनामवश्यमभ्युपेयम्,
> सर्पिषा वृक्ष इत्यादिसिद्ध्यर्थमित्यर्थः।'

इति व्युत्पत्तिपक्षपरतया भाष्यं समयूयुजत्। तथा 'ठस्येकः' (पा. सू. 7-3-50) इति सूत्रे – 'अथाप्युणादयो व्युत्पाद्यन्ते एवमपि न दोषः' इति भाष्यं व्याचक्षाणः कैयट आह –

> 'सर्पिषा यजुषा इत्याद्यर्थं व्युत्पत्तिपक्षोऽप्यङ्गीक्रियते'

इति। तथा 'आयनेयी' (पा. सू. 7-1-2) इति सूत्रे –

> 'प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च भगवतः पाणिनेराचार्यस्य
> सिद्धम्, उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि' इति भाष्यव्याख्यानावसरे –

> 'अत्र पाणिनेरित्युक्त्या सर्पिषा यजुषेत्यादि-
> कतिपयातिरिक्तोणादिषु पाणिनेरव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष
> एवाभिप्रेत इति दर्शयति' इति वदन् कैयटः कतिपयोणादिशब्दविषये व्युत्पत्तिपक्षोऽवश्याभ्युपेय इत्याविष्करोति।

नागेशस्तु उद्योते –

> 'परे तु सर्पिष इत्यादावव्युत्पत्तिपक्षेऽपि
> बहुलमित्युक्तेर्बाहुलकात् प्रत्ययसंज्ञानिमित्त
> षत्वं भवतीत्यर्थः'

इत्यादि वदन् अव्युत्पत्तिपक्षमेव समर्थयते। परं तु 'अयामन्ताल्वाय्येत्न्विष्णुषु' (पा. सू. 6-4-55) इत्यादिसूत्रेषु उणादिप्रत्ययाननूद्य प्रत्ययाश्रितानि कार्याणि विदधत् पाणिनिः कथमव्युत्पत्तिपक्षं सहेत इत्यालोचनीयं प्रामाणिकैः। अत एव लघुशब्देन्दु-शेखरे 'इसुसोः सामर्थ्ये' (पा. सू. 8-3-44) इति सूत्रे 'अयामन्त' (पा.सू. 6-4-55) इति पाणिनेर्व्युत्पत्तिपक्षस्यापि स्वीकार इत्यस्य गमकम्' इति नागेशेन प्रोक्तम्। यत्तु एतद्वाक्यानन्तरं तत्रैव शेखरे – 'व्याकरणान्तररीत्यैव वा तत्सूत्रम्' इत्याद्युक्तम्, तत् आग्रहमात्रमिति मन्यामहे।

व्युत्पत्तिपक्षस्य भाष्यसंमतत्वम्

तथा हि बहुषु भाष्यसन्दर्भेषु उणादिषु प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागोऽस्तीति सूचितम्। तान् कांश्चित् भाष्यसंदर्भान् क्रमशः प्रदर्शयामः –

1. ऋलुक् (मा. सू. 2)

भाष्यम् – एषोऽपि ऋफिडो ऋफिड्डश्च। अर्तिप्रवृत्तिश्चैव हि लोके दृश्यते। फिडफिड्डावौणादिकौ प्रत्ययौ।

2. ञमङणनम्, झभञ् (मा. सू. 7-8)

भाष्यम् – अश्नोतेर्वा पुनरौणादिकः सरन् प्रत्ययः। अश्नुत इत्यक्षरम्।

3. कर्मवत्कर्मणा तुल्यक्रियः (पा. सू. 3-1-87)

भाष्यम् – किमिदं तप इति। तपेरयमौणादिकोऽस्कारो भावसाधनः।

4. भूते (पा. सू. 3-2-84)

भाष्यम् – अनेहा इति वर्तमानकाल एव। अन्यत्र अनाहन्ता।

प्रदीपः – 'नञ्याहन एह च' (उ. सू. 4-113) इति उसिप्रत्ययोऽसत्यधिकारे सर्वस्मिन् काले तृचं बाधेत। सति त्वधिकारे वर्तमानकाल एवौणादिकस्तृचं बाधते।

5. परोक्षे लिट् (पा. सू. 3-2-115)

भाष्यम् – अक्षि पुनः किम् ? अश्नोतेरयमौणादिकः करणसाधनः सिप्रत्ययः। अश्नुतेऽनेनेत्यक्षि।

6. ण्वुल्तृचौ (पा. सू. 3-1-133)

भाष्यम् – किमर्थश्चकारः ? स्वरार्थः। चितोऽन्त उदात्तो भवतीत्यन्तोदात्तत्वं यथा स्यात्। नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्। एकाजयम्। तत्र नार्थः स्वरार्थेन चकारेणानुबन्धेन। प्रत्ययस्वरेणैव सिद्धम्। विशेषणार्थस्तर्हि। क्व विशेषणार्थेनार्थः 'अप्तृन्तृच्' इति। तु इत्युच्यमाने मातरौ मातरः पितरौ पितर इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति।

प्रदीपः – उणादिषु तृप्रत्ययान्ता मात्रादयो निपातिता इति भावः।

एवमादीनां भाष्यसंदर्भाणामालोचनेन उणादिषु प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागो वर्तत इति भाष्यकारो मन्यत इति ज्ञायते। परं तु नागेशः एवमादिविषये भाष्यकारस्य संमतिर्नास्ति, केवलं पररीत्या भाष्यकार आहेति 'उणादयो बहुलम्' (पा. सू. 3-3-1) इति सूत्रे शेखरे प्रतिपादयति। तत्र नातीव औचित्यं पश्यामः।

तस्मादेवं निष्कृष्टव्यम् – उणादिशब्दाः सर्वथा अव्युत्पन्ना इत्यपि भाष्यकारो न मन्यते, न वा सर्वथा व्युत्पन्ना इत्यपि। लक्ष्यानुसारेण पक्षद्वयमपि आश्रयणयोग्यमिति।

उणादिशब्देष्ववयवार्थानुगमः

यदा तु उणादयः शब्दाः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागपूर्वकं व्युत्पाद्यन्त इति पक्षः समाश्रीयते, तदा अवयवभूतप्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थयोः शब्दार्थेऽन्वयोऽस्ति न वेति विषये किंचित् विमृशामः। प्रायेणावयवार्थोऽनुगतो भवति। यथा वायुः इति शब्दः 'वा गतिगन्धनयोः' इति धातोः 'कृवापा' (उ. सू. 1-1) इति सूत्रेण उण्प्रत्ययान्ततया साधितः। गमनकर्ता इत्यवयवार्थः वायुशब्दार्थे वायावनुगत एवास्ति। क्वचित्तूणादिशब्दे अवयवार्थानुगमो नास्ति। यथा कशेरूः इति शब्दः कशब्दे उपपदे 'शॄ हिंसायाम्' इति धातोः 'के श्र एरङ् चास्य' (उ. सू. 1-88) इत्युणादिसूत्रेण ऊप्रत्यये धातोः 'एरङ्' आदेशे च कृते निष्पद्यते। अत्रावयवार्थो नानुगच्छति।

अत: क्वचिदवयवार्थं विनापि प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागमात्रं क्रियत इति वक्तव्यं भवति। तदुक्तं शेखरे –

'प्राय: उणादिप्रत्ययान्ता रूढिशब्दा: अवयवार्थशून्या: असन्तमप्यवयवार्थमाश्रित्य व्युत्पाद्यन्ते। तत्रापि प्राय: कर्तरि, बाहुलकादान्यत्रापीति बोध्यम्।' इति। श्वेतवनवासी च तत्र तत्र एवमेव कथयति।

पाणिनीयव्याकरणोणादिप्रकरणयोः संबन्धः

उणादिप्रकरणे ये प्रत्यया विधीयन्ते तान् प्रत्ययान् तत्तत्प्रत्ययस्थानुबन्धांश्चाश्रित्य कार्यनिष्पत्तिवेलायां पाणिनिसूत्रमेव प्रदर्श्य प्रक्रियां निर्वहन्ति। यथा 'दॄ' इति धातो: उणादिसूत्रेण (2-3) ञुण्प्रत्ययो विहित:। अस्मिन् प्रत्यये ञकार: णकारश्चेत्यनुबन्धद्वयमस्ति। तत्र णकारानुबन्धमाश्रित्य 'अचो ञ्णिति' (पा. सू. 7-2-115) इति पाणिनीयसूत्रेण धातोर्वृद्धिर्भवति। तथा ञकारानुबन्धमाश्रित्य 'ञ्नित्यादिर्नित्यम्' (पा. सू. 6-1-197) इति सूत्रेण आद्युदात्तस्वरो भवति। तथा च आद्युदात्त: दारु इति शब्द: निष्पन्नो भवति।

शाकटायनप्रणीतसूत्रविहितेषु प्रत्ययेषु पाणिनिसूत्रविहितानि कार्याणि कथं भवितुमर्हन्ति ? द्वयो: समकालत्वाभावात् अनुबन्धतत्कार्यविषये समानसंकेताभावाच्चेति। काचिदाशङ्का अवतरति। अत्र केचित् – पाणिने: पूर्वमपि इत्संज्ञा तत्कार्याणि च वैयाकरणेष्वाचार्येषु प्रसिद्धान्यासन्। तत्र च 'चित:' (पा. सू. 6-1-163) इति सूत्रस्थं – 'अकारो मत्वर्थीय:। पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशश्च चित्वान् चित इति' इति महाभाष्यं प्रमाणमिति वदन्ति।

वस्तुतस्तु तद्भाष्यं प्रकृतविषये प्रमाणं भवितुं नार्हति। तत्र हि चित: प्रत्ययस्यान्तोदात्तत्वविधाने बहुच्प्रत्ययविशिष्टस्य शब्दस्य अकच्प्रत्ययविशिष्टस्य च शब्दस्यान्तोदात्तो न सिध्येत्, बहुच:प्रकृतित: पूर्वं निवेशात् अकच: प्रकृतिमध्ये निवेशात् इत्याशङ्कां समाधातुम् – 'चित: सप्रकृतेर्बह्वकजर्थम्' इति वार्तिकं प्रवृत्तम्। तदुपरि भाष्यकार: स्वयं सूत्रत एव बहुजकज्विशिष्टयो: शब्दयोरन्तोदात्तं समर्थयितुकाम: आह – 'अथवा अकारो मत्वर्थीय: तद्यथा तुन्द: घाट इति' इति। एवं च सूत्रे चित इति अकारान्तशब्द: प्रथमैकवचनान्त इति फलितम्। यद्यकारान्तश्चित-

शब्द: तर्हि 'चितस्य' इति भवितव्यम्, 'अन्त उदात्त:' इत्यस्यान्वयार्थं कार्यिण: षष्ठ्या निर्देशस्य युक्तत्वात् इति शङ्कां मनसि निधायोक्तं भाष्यकृता – 'पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशश्च चित्वान् चित:' इति। पूर्वव्याकरणे प्रथमया कार्यी निर्दिश्यत इत्याह तत्र कैयट:। अनेन च संदर्भेण कार्यिण: प्रथमान्ततया निर्देश: पूर्वव्याकरणसंप्रदाय इत्येतावदेवावगम्यते, न त्वनुबन्धा अपि पूर्वमासन्निति। अत एव 'औङ आप:' (पा.सू. 7-1 18) इति सूत्रे भाष्यम् –

'अथवा पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशोऽयम्। पूर्वसूत्रेषु च
येऽनुबन्धा न तैरिहेत्कार्याणि क्रियन्ते।'

इति। इदं हि भाष्यं पूर्वव्याकरणेऽनुबन्धसद्भावेऽपि अनुबन्धप्रयुक्तकार्यं पूर्वव्याकरण पाणिनीयव्याकरणयोरेकरूपं न भवतीति स्पष्टं ज्ञापयति।

अन्ये तु मन्यन्ते – उणादिप्रत्ययेषु पाणिने: पूर्वमनुबन्धा नासन्। अत एवानुबन्धरहिततया 'तितुत्रतथसिसुसरकसेषु च' (पा. सू. 7-2-9) इत्यादौ पाणिनि: उणादिप्रत्ययाननुवदति। पश्चात्काल एव –

'संज्ञासु धातुरूपाणि प्रत्ययाश्च तत: परे।
कार्याद्विद्यादनूबन्धमेतच्छास्त्रमुणादिषु॥'

इति भाष्यकारवचनमवलम्ब्य गुणवृद्धिस्वरादिकार्यानुसारेणानुबन्धा: संयोजिता इति।

एतदपि न युक्तम्। तथा सति 'उणादयो बहुलम्' इति पाणिनिना णकारानुबन्धविशिष्टतया अनुवादानुपपत्ते:। तेनानुबन्धा: प्रागप्यासन्नेव। 'संज्ञासु धातुरूपाणि' इति भाष्यं तु ये शब्दा: पठ्यमानोणादिप्रकरणेनानिष्पादिता: तेषु प्रकृतिप्रत्ययतदनुबन्धादिकं कार्यानुसारेण कल्पनीयमित्येवंपरमिति पूर्वोत्तरभाष्यसंदर्भं परिशीलयतां स्पष्टमेव। यच्चोक्तं 'तितुत्रेष्वग्रहादीनाम्' इत्यादौ अनुबन्धरहितानामनुवाद इति। तत्रेदं वक्तव्यम्। पाणिनि: स्वविहितानपि प्रत्ययान् कश्चिन्निरनुबन्धकान् निर्दिशति। यथा 'तङानावात्मनेपदम्' (पा. सू. 1-4-100) इत्यत्र 'आन' इति, 'अयामन्ताल्वाय्येत्न्विष्णुषु' (पा. सू. 6-4-55) इत्यत्र 'इष्णु' इति। तत्र यत्समाधानं तदेवात्रापीति यत्किंचिदेतत्।

तस्मात् उणादिप्रत्ययेषु पाणिने: पूर्वमप्यनुबन्धा आसन्। अनुबन्धप्रयुक्तानां कार्याणां पाणिनीयव्याकरणरीत्या सुसंपत्ते: पाणिनीयव्याकरणोणादिप्रकरणयो: परमनुबन्धकार्यविषये समाना मतिवर्तत इति निर्णेतव्यं भवति।

उणादिप्रकरणस्य संस्कृतसाहित्ये उपयोगः

परिदृश्यमानेन उणादिप्रकरणेन संस्कृतसाहित्यस्य को नामोपकारः ? इति जिज्ञासा भवति। तत्र यद्यपि लौकिकसंस्कृते अस्य तावानुपयोगः समर्थयितुं न शक्यते, रूढिशब्दत्वाश्रयणेनैव कविप्रभृतीनां प्रयोगस्योपपत्तेः। तथापि वैदिकसाहित्ये एतदुणादिप्रकरणं महान्तमुपकारमातनोति। बहूनां वैदिकानां शब्दानां स्वरसंपत्तिविषये उणादिप्रकरणं बहूपकारकं विद्यते। अत एव सायणाचार्यप्रभृतयो वेदभाष्यकाराः बहुषु स्थलेषूणादिसूत्रं प्रमाणत्वेन उपन्यस्य स्वरादिकार्याणि समर्थयन्ते।

विषयमेतावता अवस्थाप्य वक्तव्यशेषं परस्तात् पृथक्प्रबन्धेन निवेदयिष्याम इति शम्।

SRI P. BALAKRISHNA MURTI

కళాసౌందర్యము

సౌందర్యమన నేమి? ఇంద్రియములకు తృప్తిని కలిగించు సన్నివేశము సౌందర్యము. కళాసౌందర్యము కళలలో గోచరించు సౌందర్యము. సౌందర్య విషయిక జ్ఞానము మానవునకు విలక్షణమైన అధ్యాత్మ సంబంధ జ్ఞానము. కాలము గడచుకొలది సౌందర్య ప్రమాణములు మారుచునే వచ్చినవి. అట్లే సౌందర్య లక్ష్యములును మారుచుండినవి. కాని యేదేనొక సుందర పదార్ధము కన్నులకు గోచరించినపుడు మాత్రము ఆనందము కల్గుట, తద్ద్వారా గాత్రము పులకితమగుట మున్నగు నంశములు చాల పురాతన కాలమునుండి అనుభూత విషయములే సౌందర్య విషయిక నిర్ణయములందు శాశ్వతములును, నాశరహితములునైన కొన్ని యంశములు గోచరించుచుండును. దేశ కాలముల ననుసరించి సౌందర్యము మారుచున్నట్లు గోచరించు చున్నది పలువురు సౌందర్యారాధకులు వివిధ మార్గములందు సౌందర్యాంశములను కన్గొనిరి. వివిధ దేశములలో పలువిధములుగా సౌందర్యమును నిర్వచించి చర్చించిరి. మన భారతదేశమున సౌందర్యమును కళలందు, ముఖ్యముగా కవితా కళయందు ఎట్లు సూత్రీకరించిరో కనుగొందము. వాస్తవమునకు విచారింపగా భారతీయ కవితా సౌందర్యము ప్రపంచమందలి యితరదేశ సౌందర్య జ్ఞానముల కన్న మిన్నయని తెలియుచున్నది.

మానవుడు తొలుతనుండియు కళాపిపాసువు ప్రాచీన కాలమునుండియు నతడు అలంకారప్రియుడు. కావున ప్రకృతిసౌందర్యమును కృత్రిమముగ ననుకరింప యత్నించెను. వ్యావసాయిక దశను మానవు డందిన తర్వాతనే మానవునకు కొంత విశ్రాంతి. విరామము లభించినవి. అతడప్పుడే తన పరిసరములందలి ప్రకృతి శోభను తిలకించి పరిశీలింప నారంభించెను. అప్పుడే జిజ్ఞాస, కళాసౌందర్య పిపాస అతని లక్షణములైనవి. పశువులనుండి మానవుని వేర్పరచునవి యీ జిజ్ఞాసా సౌందర్య పిపాసలే పశుత్వ లక్షణము నిత్యము ఆహార నిద్రాది పర్యవసాయియే. కాని మానవుని జిజ్ఞాస పరమావధినంది ఆనందింపగోరుచుండును. ఆప్రయత్నమున నాతని యాంతర విజ్ఞానము పరమాత్మ జ్ఞానమునకు మార్గదర్శక మగును.

జాంతవమైన ఉద్రేకము కేవలము సంతానోత్పత్తికి, శిశు సంరక్షణమునకు మాత్రమే నియతమైనది. మానవుని యుద్దేశమట్లు కుటుంబ మాత్రమునకే కాక తన దేశాభివృద్ధికిని సర్వ మానవశ్రేయస్సునకును వ్యాప్తమగునది కాగలదు. అతడు ప్రకృతిలోని సుందర పదార్థముల జూచినపుడు ఆనందమునంది మనసున నిమిడ్చికొనలేక యేదేని సేతరూపమునగాని, వాగ్రూపమునగాని, గేయరూపమునగాని వెలువరింప యత్నించును. అతనిలోని యాంతరమగు నానందము ఊరకుండనీయక యేవోగేయముల పాడించును. అతనిలోని శృంగారము కేవలము వివాహ సంబంధమాత్రమున తనియక ప్రణయగీతికల పాడజేయును. కవికుమారులు వ్రాయు గేయములన్నియు నట్టివే. వారిలోని యాంతరజ్యోతి వారి నట్లు వ్రాయజేయును. చిత్రకారుని అద్భుతమైన చిత్రపటమును వ్రాయజేయును. శిల్పకారుని చక్కని శిల్పమును రచింపజేయును. కళోపాసకుల నందరను వారిలోని యాంతరమైన యానంద జ్యోతి వారి నట్లాచరింపజేయును. మానవునకుగల సర్వమానవ శ్రేయస్కాముకత పరోపకార మొనరించుటతో తనివినొందును. అతనికిగల అంతరమైన ప్రణయము స్వర్గసౌఖ్యములను కలలరూపమున గనజేయును. మధురమైన గానమున నాయానంద పరిపూర్ణతను కన్గొన జూచును. భక్తుడైనచో అతని భక్తి కేవలము ఆత్మానుసంధానముతో తనివి నొందక, యాంతరమైన యానంద మాతని భగవన్నామసంకీర్తనము మధురముగ పాడజేయును. ఆ భక్త్యతిశయముతోడనే ఆ భక్తుడు ఆనందాశ్రుపులకితగాత్రుడై యెంతోచక్కగ పాడిన భగవత్సాక్షాత్కారమగునో యూహించికొని యంతచక్కగా గానముచేయ నుద్యుక్తుడగును. భక్తి అంతరమైన ఆనందచ్ఛాయయే మానవు డాచరించు వివిధ కర్మలను భగవత్ప్రేరణమున గల్గుచున్నవని ఆత్మైక్యము ననుసంధానించునట్లు అతని ప్రేమకూడ అఖండమైన అంతరమగు నానందముననే పర్యవసాయి కాగలదు మానవు డే సుందరమైన కార్యము గావించినను నాతని యాంతరమైన యానంద ప్రేరణముననే యట్లాచరింపగలుగుచున్నాడు. కావున ప్రణయము, సత్యము, శివము, సుందరము అను వాని విషయికమైన యాంతర జిజ్ఞాసయే కళకు కారణమగుచున్నది

ఈ విషయము తెలిసికొనుటకు యథార్థమైన మానవత్వమును తెలిసికొనవలయును. సామాన్యముగా మానవుడు తన్నుతాను తెలిసికొనడు తనశక్తి సామర్థ్యముల తెలిసికొన యత్నింపడు. యథార్థమైన మానవుడు తన్నుతా నెఱుగును. ఆత్మవిశ్వాసము గలిగినపుడే తనను తాను తెలిసికొనును. ఆరోగ్యవంతుడైన మానవుడు తనశక్తిని తాను తెలియగలడు. రోగి తనశక్తి రోగముచే క్షీణించిన దగుటచే తానెఱుగక, తాను తలచినట్లు చేయజాలడు. కామెర్ల రోగము కలవానికి చూచున దంతయు పచ్చగనే కనబడును. ఆరోగ్యవంతుడు తాను జూచి నుడువు వివిధ వర్ణముల నీ కామెర్లరోగి విశ్వసించడు. తనకు గోచరించిన పసిమియే నిక్కమని నమ్మును ఆకామెర్లరోగము నివర్తించి యథార్థస్థితికి వచ్చినపుడే వివిధ వర్ణములగాంచి గుర్తించు నేర్పుగలిగి సంతోషించును మనకు మనసున తామస రాజసభావములు నిండియున్నపుడు మన నైజస్వభావము ఆచ్ఛాదితమై ప్రకటము

కాకుండును. సచ్చిదానందాత్మకమగు మన నైజము నది కప్పివేయును. ఈ సర్వప్రపంచమున కంతటికి వెలుగునిచ్చు సూర్యునిగూడ నల్లని మబ్బు లాచ్ఛాదించి నిండువెలుగును ప్రసరింప జేయకుండునట్లు మనకును తామస రాజస భావములు మన యాంతరమైన యానంద జ్యోతి నావరించును. సాత్త్వికభావములు మనసున పొడమినపుడు మన యాంతరజ్యోతిని తెరవలె నవి సూక్ష్మముగ నావరించియుండును. చంద్రునిచెంత నొక చిన్నమబ్బుతునకయు మఱొక చంద్రునివలె ప్రకాశించునట్లు, ఆనందజ్యోతి తన ప్రభావమున మన సాత్త్విక స్వభావమును కూడ వెలిగింపజేయును ప్రతిమానవుడు నట్టి సాత్త్వికావస్థ నొకప్పుడైనను తప్పక యనుభవించుచుండును. అత్తరి నతడు శాంతస్వభావుడై తా పరికించు విషయములనెల్ల లెస్సగా సమగ్రముగా గనగలడు. సముద్రతీరమున పున్నమరాత్రులందును. సుందరయువతీ సాన్నిధ్యమునందును, ముగ్ధ మధుర శిశుసందర్శనమునను, అందమైన ప్రాకార భవనాదుల గాంచినపుడును. మనోహర చిత్ర శిల్పాదుల సందర్శనమునను, మోహన సంగీత శ్రవణమునను, రసవత్కావితానుభవమునను మానవుని యాంతరమైన ఆనందజ్యోతి యాతనిని పరవశుని జేయును అత్తరి నాతని సాత్త్వికావస్థ తనకెట్టి యానందమును గల్పించుచున్నదను విషయమును గుర్తింప గల్గును. అట్లే తామస రాజస భావావృతమైనపుడు తనకట్టి యానందము కల్గదనియు దెలిసికొని, తనకు సహజమైనది సాత్త్వికమే యని గుర్తింప గల్గును. కావున కళ స్వతఃప్రకాశమనియు, అనావృతమగు నాత్మయొక్క సాత్త్వికావస్థ విలాసమనియు తెలియుచున్నది.

ఈ సందర్భమున మన భారతీయ వేదాంత విజ్ఞానమున ఆత్మ నావరించియున్న పంచ కోశముల విషయము తెలిసికొనదగియున్నది. మానవు డొక స్థూలశరీరమును, శక్తిరూప కోశమును, చంచలమనోమయ కోశమును. శాంతము, స్థిరచిత్తతగల సూక్ష్మశరీరమును, మఱియు నానందమయ కోశమును కారణశరీరముగను గల్గియున్నాడు. ఈ యైదు కోశములను 1 అన్నమయ కోశము (స్థూలశరీరము) 2 ప్రాణమయ కోశము (శక్తిరూపము) 3 మనోమయ కోశము 4 విజ్ఞానమయ కోశము (సూక్ష్మశరీరము) 5 ఆనందమయ కోశము నని వేదాంతమున నుడువబడియున్నవి. ఈ యైదింటిలో అన్నమయ కోశము స్థూల శరీరమునకు కారణము. ప్రాణమయ, మనోమయ, విజ్ఞానమయ కోశములు సూక్ష్మశరీరమున కుండును. ఇక ఆనందమయ కోశము కారణ శరీరమునకు సంబంధించినది. ఈ ఆనందమయ కోశము మూలముననే బాహ్యప్రపంచమునందలి తేజస్సునగల వివిధ వర్ణములను జూడగల శక్తి లభించుచున్నది. ఆనందమయ స్వరూపమును శుద్ధమనకు నాత్మజ్యోతియే బాహ్యమునగల పెక్కు వర్ణములను స్ఫటికత్రికోణమున వలె కనుగొను శక్తి గల్గియున్నది.

సౌందర్యమును నిర్వచించుట చాలకష్టము. ఆదికాలమునుండియు మానవుని ఉత్సాహశక్తి (Spirit) ప్రపంచమందలి సౌందర్య మాధుర్యమును గ్రోలగలిగియే యున్నది. ఏదే నొక సుందరపదార్థమును గన్నప్పుడు తనకెందులకు ఆనందము కలుగుచున్నదని

కాని, సౌందర్య లక్షణమెట్టిదని కాని, దాని ప్రయోజనమేమని కానియాత డెన్నడును విచారించి యెరుగడు. ప్రకృతి చాల సుందరముగా నున్నదనియు, ఆ యువతి కన్నులు చాల అందముగా నున్నవనియు, ఆ మహావీరుని చేష్టలు చాల బాగున్నవనియు, ఆతని ఆలోచనలు మంచివిగా నున్నవనియు నివ్విధమున పల్కుచుందుము. ఇట్లనుకొనుటవలన సౌందర్య ముపయోగపడు చున్నదా? మానవ వాంఛలకు తృప్తినిచ్చుచున్నదా? ఇది అవయవముల పొంకమున గాని, సమానపరిమాణమునగాని యున్నదా! ఇదియొక మాయయా? సూర్యుడు, చంద్రుడు మొదలగు దివ్యజ్యోతులను చూచినపుడు మన మానందించుచున్నాము కదా? కారణమేమి? ఇది యాంతరమైన ఆత్మస్వరూపముయొక్క వికారమా? లేక బాహ్యసంబంధియా? దీనికి సమాధానముగా ఆంతరమగు నానందమయజ్యోతి చిహ్నమే సౌందర్యమని తెలియుచున్నది.

ప్రపంచమందలి సర్వమానవులును, భిన్న భిన్న దేశస్థులు సౌందర్యమును భిన్న భిన్నముగా నిర్వచించిరి. కొందరు ఐక్యము, ఔచితి, సమత, సౌందర్యావయవము లనిరి. కొందరు క్రమబద్ధముగ నుండుటయే సౌందర్య మనిరి కొందరు రంగు, ఆకృతి, అభివ్యక్తి, ప్రయోగము, సౌందర్యాంగములనిరి. సత్యము, శివము, సుందరము అనునవి కూడ భిన్నములని కొందరూహించుచున్నారు. వాస్తవముగా నివి భిన్నములా? లేక ఇవన్నియు కలిసి యేకత్వమును జెందినవా? సృజనాత్మకమైన కర్మయందు ఈ విషయమెన్నడో కాని విచార్యము కాదు. ఒక సుందరమైన కళాఖండమును సృజించిన వానికి ఆనంద మతిశయము. ఆతనిత్రృప్తికి దేశకాలాదు లాటంకములు కావు. ఆతడింకను అందమునకై పరితపించును. మహాకవులెందరో సౌందర్యారాధనమున, కళాపోషణమున తనివినందక ఆవాపోద్వాపములచే తుదివిజ్ఞయమునకు రాలేక తమ్ముతామే నిందించుకొనుచున్నారు. అభిజ్ఞాన శాకుంతల నాటకమున కవికులతిలకుడగు కాళిదాసు, అనుకరింపరాని విధమున నెంతో మనోహరముగ శకుంతలా సౌందర్యమును వ్యంగ్యముగా నుడివినాడు. ప్రత్యంగ వర్ణనమెచ్చటను చేయలేదు. ఆమె ముఖమున వ్రాలి యొక గండు తుమ్మెద బాధించుచుండగా నా దృశ్యమును జూచి రా జిట్లనుకొనును:

> "చలాపాంగాం దృష్టిం స్పృశసి బహుశో వేపథుమతీం,
> రహస్యాఖ్యాయీవ స్వనసి మృదు కర్ణాంతికచరః ।
> కరౌవ్యాధున్వత్యాః పిబసి రతిసర్వస్వ మధరం,
> వయం తత్త్వాన్వేషాన్మధుకర! హతా స్త్వం ఖలు కృతీ"

అం 1 - శ్లో. 21.

(ఓ తుమ్మెదా! నీవుచాల ధన్యుడవు. ఆమె క్రీగంటిచూపులచే జూడబడితివి. ఓగులు వణకు చున్న యామెను పలుమారు స్పృశించుచున్నావు. ఆమె చెవిచెంత జేరి మధురముగ నేదియో ప్రణయ రహస్యములు వినిపించుచున్నట్లున్నావు. ఆమె చేతులెంతగా విదిర్చుచు వలదని వారించుచున్నను రతిసర్వస్వమగు నామె యధరమును చవిచూడగల్గినావు. ఓయి మధుపా!

మేము తత్త్వాన్వేషణమున శ్రమపడి చెడితిమి. నీవే సర్వసమర్థుడవు. తత్త్వజిజ్ఞాసకంటె కేవలానందానుభవమును గోరుటచే నీవే మిన్న.")

ఇందు శకుంతల ముఖము పద్మగంధియు, పద్మసదృశము నని ధ్వనించుచున్నది. తద్వారా ఆమె లోకోత్తరసౌందర్యవతి యని తెలియుచున్నది.

సృజనాత్మకమైన సౌందర్యానుభూతి పెల్లుబికినపుడు మానవుని యుత్సాహశక్తి క్షణకాలమూరకుండి యా సౌందర్యకారణ మరయగోరును. పదార్థములకు ప్రయోజనము వలెనే సౌందర్యముకూడ నొక యంశము. మానవుడు కేవల ముదరంభరవాచార్వటి కల వాడు కాడు. అతనికి పంచేంద్రియములతోపాటు, మనస్సు, హృదయము. ఆత్మకలవు గదా! మానవజాతి శైశవమున ఆకసమండలి సూర్య చంద్ర నక్షత్రాదుల సౌందర్యము, ప్రకృతి లోని కుసుమముల శోభ, పక్షులలోని వివిధ వర్ణసౌందర్యములు, కోకిలాది పక్షుల మధుర గానములు మానవుని హృదయము నాకర్షించి యాతని పరవశుని జేసినవి. అలంకరణ దృష్టిచే ననుకరణ మేర్పడినదాది మెలమెల్లగా ఆనందపరవశమైన హృదయమునుండి కళ యావిర్భవించినది. అనంతములైన ప్రణయము, విజ్ఞానము, ఆనందము అనునవి పూర్వ జన్మార్జితములై మానవునకు సంక్రమించుచుండును. అనగా నవి సచ్చిదానందమయములగు నాత్మగుణములేయని భావము.

సౌందర్య తత్త్వము బ్రహ్మ తత్త్వమువలె ఆనందమే. భారతీయ తత్త్వశాస్త్రజ్ఞుని వలె భారతీయ సౌందర్యోపాసకులును నీ యానందమే సర్వమునకు కారణమని పదేపదేనొక్కి వక్కాణించిరి.

తైత్తిరీయోపనిషత్తున నిట్లున్నది:

1. 'ఆనందో బ్రహ్మేతి వ్యజానాత్, ఆనందాద్ధ్యేవ ఖల్విమాని భూతాని జాయంతే। ఆనందేన జాతాని జీవంతి। ఆనందం ప్రయాం త్యభిసంవిశంతీతి'॥ III-6.

2. 'ఆనందో బ్రహ్మణో విద్వా న్నబిభేతి కుతశ్చన'. II-9.

1. బ్రహ్మపదార్థము ఆనందమని తెలిసికొనెను. సమస్తప్రాణులును ఆనందము వలననే పుట్టుచున్నవి. పుట్టిన ప్రాణికోటి యంతయు నానందముననే జీవించుచున్నది. వారందరు ఆనందముకొఱకే ప్రాకులాడి యానందముననే ప్రవేశించుచున్నారు.

2. బ్రహ్మపదార్థ మానందస్వరూపమని యెఱింగినవాడు ఎవరివలనను భయపడడు.

కళాసౌందర్యానుభూతివలన కల్గు నానందమును, ఆత్మానుసంధానమున సమాధ్యవస్థలో ననుభవించు ఆనందమును చాల సన్నిహితములు. కావుననే కావ్యానందము (రసము) బ్రహ్మానంద సహోదరమని నుడివినారు. కళోపాసకుడు తన కళాఖండమును జూచి మురిసిపోయి అనుభవించు ఆనందము అఖండమగు బ్రహ్మానందముయొక్క యొకఛాయయే యని మాత్రము గుర్తింపదగినది.

పాశ్చాత్యు లీ విషయ మెఱుంగరు. భారతదేశము కళోపాసనమున చాల వెనుక బడినదని యందురు. కాని భారతీయహృదయము ప్రతిభావ్యుత్పత్తులతో కూడి యుండుటచే కళాసౌందర్యవిషయమున నెప్పుడు నజ్ఞాతముగా నుండలేదు. ఇతర ప్రపంచమంతయు తత్త్వాంధమై యున్నప్పుడు భారతదేశమొక పెనుదివ్వెగా వెలసినదని పాశ్చాత్య ప్రముఖులే 'Light of the East' అని మనదేశమును ప్రశంసించిరి. భారతీయ వాఙ్మయ భాండాగారము ప్రపంచమున కంతటికిని వెల్లడియైనదే. మధ్యకాలమున కొంత యడుగంటినను రవీంద్ర కవీంద్రుడు భారతీయకవితాధిక్యమును పునఃప్రతిష్ఠించెను. వంగదేశ చిత్రకళాఖండములు ప్రాచీన భారతీయ ఘనతను ప్రపంచమునకు చాటినవి. స్పష్టములైన కళాసౌంద ర్య లక్షణములు భారతదేశముననేకాని మఱెచ్చటను లభింపలేదు.

భారతీయులు తొలుతనుండియే సౌందర్యారాధకులై రమణీయత యన నేమో నిర్వచించియున్నారు. కావ్యములందు గలుగు నానందమును రసమనుచున్నాము. కళాసౌందర్య విషయమునను ప్రధానముగా నిర్వచింపబడిన దీ రసవిషయమే. ఈ కావ్యరసము బ్రహ్మానంద సహోదరమనిరి కదా! మమ్మటాచార్యుడు తన కావ్యప్రకాశ గ్రంథమున "సకల ప్రయోజనమౌళిభూతం సమనంతరమేవ రసాస్వాదనసముద్భూతం విగళితవేద్యాంతర మానందం" (జీవిత లక్ష్యములలోనెల్ల శిరోభూషణ తుల్యమైనదియు, రసాస్వాదనానుభూతి వెనువెంటనే కల్గునదియు, మనసున కితరము నెద్దియు గోచరింపనీయక సంతోషపఱచునదియు నగు నానందము కావ్యానందము) అనెను. తైత్తిరీయోపనిషత్తున 'రసో వై సః, రసం హ్యేవాయం లబ్ధ్వానందీ భవతి" (అదియే రసము. దానిని పొందుటచే నాత్మ ఆనందమయ మగుచున్నది). రసము రమణీయపదార్థ రామణీయకతానుభూతియందును, కళయందును రెంటను గోచరించును. భర్తృహరి "జయంతి తే సుకృతినో రససిద్ధాః కవీశ్వరాః" (రససిద్ధులును, పుణ్యకర్మాచరణులును నగు కవీశ్వరు లెల్లప్పుడును జయశీలురే) అని ప్రశంసించినాడు.

ఈ 'రస' పదము కేవలము బ్రహ్మపదార్థమును, కావ్యానందమును మాత్రమే బోధింపుట లేదు. దీనికిగల నానార్థములలో స్వర్ణకారవిద్యకును. జీవితసుధయగు మద్యము నకును అన్వయించును. కళాసౌందర్యానుభూతివలన కల్గు నానందము మనజీవితపథమును స్వర్ణమయ మొనర్చి, మనమర్త్యత్వమును గుర్తింపజేసి బ్రహ్మానందతుల్యమైన యానందము

ననుభవించునట్లు చేసి. తన్మూలమున బ్రహ్మానందానుభూతికి మార్గదర్శక మగుచున్నది. సాధారణముగా లోకమున మనకు విషయానుభూతివలన గల్గుసౌఖ్యము కళాసౌందర్యమునకన్న భిన్నమైనది. ఈ కళాసౌందర్యము మానవుల కెల్ల వేళలందును. సర్వావస్థలందును అనుభవింప యోగ్యమైనది. ఇందు స్వార్థ మిసుమంతయు లేదు. నిర్మలము పవిత్రము నైన యిది మానవున కొకయాధిక్యము నిచ్చి చంచలమగు మనస్సునకు తన్మయత నాపాదించి కాలక్రమమున బ్రహ్మానందానుభూతికి తోడ్పడగలదు. సౌందర్యము అనునదే రమణీయత, చారుత అని కావ్యపరిభాషలో పేర్కొనబడి౦ది.

మాఘకవి తన 'శిశుపాలవధ' మను గ్రంథమందు 'క్షణేక్షణే యన్నవతాముపైతి తదేవ రూపం రమణీయతాయాః' అని రైవతకపర్వతదర్శనమున దాని సౌందర్యమునుగూర్చి నుడివినాడు. ఎప్పటికప్పుడు క్రొంగ్రొత్తగా గోచరించుటయే రమణీయతకు లక్షణమనియందు తెల్పినాడు సౌందర్యతత్త్వ మదియే సుందరపదార్థమందలి శక్తియగు 'క్రొంగ్రొత్త' లక్షణమే మనల నాకర్షించి ప్రతిక్షణమును దానిని కొనియాడునట్లు చేయును. ఒకరత్నమును చేత గ్రహించి త్రిప్పిత్రిప్పి చూచునపుడెల్ల ప్రతియొక్క 'త్రిప్పుట' యందును క్రొంగ్రొత్త కాంతుల నీనుచు నందగించును. ఒక ముత్యపుచిప్పను త్రిప్పుచు నెటుచూచినను సర్వాంగ సుందరముగ నుండును. అట్లే యే క్రొత్త విషయమైనను యథార్థముగ సుందరమైనచో మనల నట్లాకర్షించును. ఆ సౌందర్యశక్తి యట్టిది!

కొన్నిసందర్భములలో మన కనుభవమున లేకున్నను పూర్వజన్మార్జిత సంస్కారము వలన కొన్ని యీ జన్మలో స్మరణమునకు వచ్చుచుండును. కాళిదాసు తన అభిజ్ఞాన శాకుంతలమున

" రమ్యాణి వీక్ష్య మధురాంశ్చ నిశమ్య శబ్దాన్,
పర్యుత్సుకోభవతియత్సుఖితోఽపి జంతుః।
తచ్చేతసా స్మరతి నూన మబోధపూర్వం,
భావస్థిరాణి జననాంతరసౌహృదాని ॥ "

అని తెల్పినాడు. 5 అం. — 2 శ్లో

ఏ దేని రమ్యమైన పదార్థమును చూచినపుడుగాని, మధురమగు సంగీతమును వినినపుడుగాని మానవుడెంత సుఖముగ జీవనము గడపుచున్నను. మనస్సున నేదియో కలతపెట్టబడి యుత్సుకు డగుచున్నాడు. ఎందుకు? పూర్వజన్మ సంస్కారములు వాసనారూపమున నీ జన్మమున గూడ జీవులకు సంక్రమించుచుండును. ఈ జన్మలో ఆ యనుభవము లేకున్నను ఆ పూర్వజన్మ సంస్కృతి బలమున జీవి అట్టియనుభవమును, తెలియకుండ మనసున స్మరించి యానందించును.

'కవివాక్కు, బ్రహ్మచే నిర్మింపబడిన నియమములు లేనట్టిదియు, ఆనందమయమును, స్వయంవ్యక్తమును, పరతంత్రము గానిదియు, నవరసములచే ప్రకాశించునదియు నగు ప్రపంచమును సృజించుచున్నది'. అని నుడివినాడు.

ఇవ్విధి భారతీయ కావ్యసౌందర్యోపాసకులు సృజనశక్తియే కళాసారమని స్పష్టముగా నుడివియున్నారు. సౌందర్యము, మాధుర్యము, ఆనందము అనునవియే కళాసారములని భారతీయాలంకారికులందరు నుడివిన విషయమే. వేదములు ప్రభుసమ్మితములు. ప్రభువులు శాసకులగునట్లు వేదములు కర్తవ్యాకర్తవ్యములను మనకు విధిగా శాసించునట్లు బోధించుచున్నవి. ఆ శాసనము ప్రకారము మన విధులను వినయముతో నాచరించిన కల్గుఫలమానందము. ఆ సంతోషము శాసించుటలో లేదు. పురాణములు సుహృత్సమ్మితములు. వేదసారములగు పురాణములు ప్రభుశాసనమువలె భయజనకములుగాక, వానిననుసరించి యాచరించినచో నానందము నొసగుచున్నవి. అవి స్నేహితునివలె హితమును బోధించుచున్నవి. ఇక కావ్యము — కాంతాసమ్మితము. కాంతవలె కర్తవ్యములను మనోహరముగ, ప్రియముగ, వ్యంగ్యముగ బోధించును. కాంతవాక్యములు మనోహరములు, ప్రియములునై యానందమును కల్గించునట్లు కావ్యవాక్యములును ఆనందమును కలుగజేయును.

కళోపాసకుడు ద్రష్ట. శ్రీశంకరాచార్యులు కవిని 'క్రాంతదర్శి' అనెను. అనగా కవి వాలామూరము పరికించి సత్యమునెఱుగువాడని భావము. కళోపాసకుడు సౌందర్యమును తాను ఆనందపారవశ్యమున మైమఱచిన యవస్థలందు గాంచి, తర్వాత దాని యనుభూతికై యువ్విళ్ళూరుచుండును. అతని మనస్సు ఒక విజ్ఞానజ్యోతిగానుండి శాశ్వతమైన వెలుగు నిచ్చును. అతనియందు జీవితవృక్షమెల్లప్పుడును కుసుమితమగుచుండును. కావ్యగాన శ్రవణమున మనకును, పరవశులమగునంతటి ఆనందానుభూతి కల్గుచున్నదికదా! అదియే భారతీయ కళోపాసనల లక్ష్యము. కళయొక్క ప్రయోజనమును నదియే ఈ విధముగ భక్తి ప్రేమల సంబంధము భారతదేశమున మాత్రమే కలదు. శృంగారాదిరసములన్నియు ఆనంద స్వరూపమగు భక్తిరసముయొక్క ఛాయలే.

కావ్యసౌందర్యము-కళయొక్కయు, సౌందర్యము యొక్కయు మద్భూతరూపమే. ఈ కావ్యసౌందర్యమును బోధించు శాస్త్రము అలంకార శాస్త్రము, లేక సాహిత్య శాస్త్రము. అలంకారము, సాహిత్యము నను నీరెండును కావ్యసౌందర్యముయొక్క రెండు గుణములు. అలంకారమన సుందరపదార్థ సౌందర్య ప్రకాశనము. సాహిత్యము ఆ అలంకారమును, లేక సౌందర్యమును ప్రకాశింపజేయు శాస్త్రము; ఆత్మకు సంబంధించిన కళయననగును. అది సాహిత్యమున పద్యములందలి పదపదార్థసంబంధము మాత్రముకాదు. సంగీతమున నాదము భావము అను వాని కలయికగాదు. చిత్రకళయందు వర్ణభావముల మేళనముగాదు. శిల్పమున భావ సౌందర్యముల సంపుటి కాదు. వాస్తుశాస్త్రమున సౌందర్యవిస్తృతుల కూడికకాదు మఱి

'కవివాక్కు, బ్రహ్మచే నిర్మింపబడిన నియమములు లేనట్టిదియు, ఆనందమయమును, స్వయంవ్యక్తమును, పరతంత్రము గానిదియు, నవరసములచే ప్రకాశించునదియు నగుప్రపంచమును సృజించుచున్నది'. అని నుడివినాడు.

ఇవ్విధి భారతీయ కావ్యసౌందర్యోపాసకులు సృజనశక్తియే కళాసారమని స్పష్టముగా నుడివియున్నారు. సౌందర్యము, మాధుర్యము, ఆనందము అనునవియే కళాసారములని భారతీయాలంకారికులందరు నుడివిన విషయమే. వేదములు ప్రభు సమ్మితములు. ప్రభువులు శాసకులగునట్లు వేదములు కర్తవ్యాకర్తవ్యములను మనకు విధిగా శాసించునట్లు బోధించుచున్నవి. ఆ శాసనముప్రకారము మన విధులను వినయముతో నాచరించిన కల్గుఫలమానందము. ఆ సంతోషము శాసించుటలో లేదు. పురాణములు సుహృత్సమ్మితములు. వేదసారములగు పురాణములు ప్రభుశాసనమువలె భయజనకములుగాక, వానిననుసరించి యాచరించినచో నానందము నొసగుచున్నవి. అవిస్నేహితునివలె హితమును బోధించుచున్నవి. ఇక కావ్యము — కాంతాసమ్మితము. కాంతవలె కర్తవ్యములను మనోహరముగ, ప్రియముగ, వ్యంగ్యముగ బోధించును. కాంతవాక్యములు మనోహరములు, ప్రియములునై యానందమును కల్గించునట్లు కావ్యవాక్యములును ఆనందమును కలుగజేయును.

కళోపాసకుడు ద్రష్ట. శ్రీశంకరాచార్యులు కవిని 'క్రాంతదర్శి' అనెను. అనగా కవి చాలాదూరము పరికించి సత్యమునెఱుగువాడని భావము. కళోపాసకుడు సౌందర్యమును తాను ఆనందపారవశ్యమున మైమఱచిన యవస్థలందు గాంచి, తర్వాత దాని యనుభూతికై యువ్విళ్ళూరుచుండును. అతని మనస్సు ఒక విజ్ఞానజ్యోతిగానుండి శాశ్వతమైన వెలుగు నిచ్చును. అతనియందు జీవితవృక్షమెల్లప్పుడును కుసుమితమగుచుండును. కావ్యగాన శ్రవణమున మనకును, పరవశులమగునంతటి ఆనందానుభూతి కల్గుచున్నదికదా! అదియే భారతీయ కళోపాసనల లక్ష్యము. కళయొక్క ప్రయోజనమును నదియే ఈ విధముగ భక్తి ప్రేమల సంబంధము భారతదేశమున మాత్రమే కలదు. శృంగారాదిరసములన్నియు ఆనంద స్వరూపమగు భక్తిరసముయొక్క ఛాయలే.

కావ్యసౌందర్యము-కళయొక్కయు, సౌందర్యము యొక్కయు మద్భూతరూపమే. ఈ కావ్యసౌందర్యమును బోధించు శాస్త్రము అలంకార శాస్త్రము, లేక సాహిత్య శాస్త్రము. అలంకారము, సాహిత్యము నను నీరెండును కావ్యసౌందర్యముయొక్క రెండు గుణములు. అలంకారమన సుందరపదార్థ సౌందర్య ప్రకాశనము. సాహిత్యము ఆ అలంకారమును, లేక సౌందర్యమును ప్రకాశింపజేయు శాస్త్రము; ఆత్మకు సంబంధించిన కళయననగును. అది సాహిత్యమున పద్యములందలి పదపదార్థసంబంధము మాత్రముకాదు. సంగీతమున నాదము భావము అను వాని కలయికగాదు. చిత్రకళయందు వర్ణభావముల మేళనముగాదు. శిల్పమున భావ సౌందర్యముల సంపుటి కాదు. వాస్తుశాస్త్రమున సౌందర్యవిస్తృతుల కూడికకాదు మఱి

యేమనగా, అంతమాత్రమే కాక సౌందర్యానందముల సమ్మేళనము. అనగా కళలోని సౌందర్యము, ఆత్మయందలి ఆనందము అను వాని రెంటియొక్క కలయికయే.

ఇంతకును, రసికత, లేక సహృదయత యనునది చాలముఖ్యము. భారతీయాలంకార శాస్త్రములన్నియు, రసికత, లేక సహృదయత కావ్యానందానుభూతి కావశ్యకము లని ఘోషించుచున్నవి. సహృదయుల సంఖ్య హెచ్చినగాని కళావిజ్ఞాన మున్నతస్థితికి రాజాలదు. అట్లుకానిచో కళావిజ్ఞానమొక యరణ్యరోదనమే కాగలదు. సహృదయుడైన మానవుని పైననే కళలుగాని, కావ్యములుగాని, అలంకారశాస్త్రములుగాని ఆధారపడి యుండును.

Dr. G. APPA RAO

సర్వజ్ఞుడు – ప్రజాకవి

తెలుగున వేమన్నవలె కన్నడ సాహిత్య ప్రపంచమున సర్వజ్ఞుడు గొప్ప ప్రగతిశీలియైన ప్రజాకవి. కన్నడదేశమున ఈతనిపేరు వినని వారు గాని, అక్షరాస్యులలో ఈతని వచనములు చదువని వారు గాని లేరని చెప్పుటలో రవంతైన అతిశయోక్తి ఉండదు. పండితుడు, పామరుడు, కార్మికుడు, కర్షకుడు, అను భేదము లేకుండ అందరి రసనాగ్రములందు ఈ మహావ్యక్తి వచనములు నృత్యము సేయుచుండును. సామాన్య మానవుని దైనందిన జీవితమునకు సంబంధించిన అనేక సమస్యలకు ఈతని వచనములు పరిష్కార మార్గము చూపు భవ్య సూత్రములు.

సర్వజ్ఞుడు గొప్ప తార్కికుడు. ఈతని లోకజ్ఞాన మపారము. వంచనకు, ఉదాసీనతకు ఇతని హృదయములో చోటు లేదు. మానవుని ప్రతి సమస్యను తన సమస్యగా తీసికొని, దాని పరిష్కారమార్గము నన్వేషించు ప్రత్యక్షవేదాంతి యితడు. ప్రజా జీవితములో ఇతడు ప్రవేశింపని చోటుగాని, ఎరుగని రహస్యములు గాని, ఆలోచింపని కష్టసుఖములుగాని లేవని చెప్పవచ్చును. ఈ విషయమున సర్వజ్ఞ నామధేయము ఈ ప్రజాకవికి సర్వవిధముల తగియున్నది.

జాతి, కుల, మత, రహితసహకారసంఘ నిర్మాణము (Voluntary Co-operative socialism) ఇతని జీవితాశయమని ఇతని వచనములే మనకు చెప్పక చెప్పుచున్నవి. ఇతడు మూఢవిశ్వాసములను, మూర్తి పూజలను ఖండించెను. జ్ఞాన శక్తియే మోక్షసాధనమని అనేకవిధముల ప్రజలకు బోధించెను సత్యవ్రతులై దయా దాక్షిణ్యాది గుణ విశేషములతో విచక్షణా జ్ఞానమును, వివేచనాశక్తిని పెంపొందింప జేసికొనుడని వారిని అడుగడుగున కోరెను. ఇతనిబోధలు, ఉపదేశములు హేతువాద విలసితములై భావుకుల మస్తిష్కమునకు మంచి విందు నొసగి, పరిపూర్ణానందమును కలుగజేయును. కులగోత్రములగూర్చి ఈ ప్రగతిశీలుడు ఒకచోట చెప్పిన ఈ వచనములే ఇందులకు చక్కని నిదర్శనము.

"నడెవుదుంటె భూమి కుడివుదుంటె నీరు
సుదువగ్ని యొంటె ఇరుతిరలు
కులగోత్ర నడువె యత్తణదు సర్వజ్ఞ!

అవయవగళెల్లరిగె సమవాగి యిరుతిరలు
భవి భక్త శ్వపచ శూద్ర వివరింతెంబ
కవన దెత్తణదు సర్వజ్ఞ!

జాతిహీనన మనెయ జ్యోతి తా హీనవె ?
జాతి విజాతి యెన బేడ
దేవ నొలిదావగె జాత సర్వజ్ఞ!"

'ఒకభూమిపై నడచి, ఒకనీటినే త్రాగి, ఒక అగ్నిలోనే అందరు కాలిపోవు చుండగ ఇంక కులగోత్రముల గొప్పయెక్కడిది?

అందరు మానవుల అవయవయములన్నియు సమానముగా నుండ, ఇతడు భవి, అతడు భక్తుడు, ఇతడు శ్వపచుడు, అతడు శూద్రుడు — అను భేదమెక్కడినుండి వచ్చినది?

జాతిహీను నింట వెలసిన జ్యోతి తా హీన మగునే ? జాతి, విజాతి, అని యన వద్దు. దేవునకు ప్రియమైనవాడే ఉత్తమజాతికి చెందినవాడు.'

దైవసృష్టిలో మానవులందరు సమానులే ఒకరు ఎక్కువ, ఇంకొకరు తక్కువ అని చెప్పుటగాని, నాది పెద్దకులము, వారిది చిన్నకులము అనుటగాని మిక్కిలి అవివేకము.

ఈ ప్రకృతిలో గల సమస్త శక్తులు అందరిపట్ల సమానముగనే పనిచేయును. వానికి పాక్షికదృష్టిలేదు. ఎందులకో ? ఈ మూర్ఖప్రజలు వ్యత్యాసములతో సతమతమై పోవుచున్నారు. దయాదాక్షిణ్యాది గుణవిశేషములు కలిగి, జాతి, మత, కుల భేదములు లేనివారై, బాధ్యతాయుత నైతిక జీవన సంపత్తితో నొప్పిన మానవోత్తములే దేవున కత్యంత ప్రియమైన వారు. అటువంటి మహావ్యక్తులు ప్రస్తుత వర్ణాశ్రమ ధర్మములప్రకారముగా ఏర్పడిన హీనజాతిలో పుట్టినను వారి మహనీయతకు ఏవిధమైన న్యూనత రాదు. అని సర్వజ్ఞుడు కరుడుగట్టిన కులగోత్ర సంకుచిత దృష్టిపై తన హేతువాద వజ్రాయుధమును ప్రయోగించెను.[1]

---

1. తన్నలిహా లింగవను.... }
కల్లు కల్లనె ఒట్టు.... } మొదలగు ఈతని వచనములను చూడనగును.
కల్లు గుండిన మేకె... }

సర్వజ్ఞుడు నైతికమైన విలువలను గూర్చి, సత్యవ్రత దాన ధర్మముల గూర్చి ప్రాస్తావికముగా అనేక విధముల ప్రజలకు బోధించెను. అవన్నియు అటుండ, ఈతడు లౌకిక ధర్మములను గూర్చి చెప్పిన కొన్నివచనములు అత్యంత మనోహరములై యున్నవి.

'మానవుడు తన నీతినియమములకు భంగము వాటిల్లని విధమున, కపటులు, మూర్ఖులు నగు వారి నడుమ, దంతముల నడుమ నాలుక వలె బహుజాగ్రత్తగా వ్యవహరింపవలెను. (దంత పంక్తియ నడువె ఎంతిప్పుదదు జిహ్వె). ఒక్కొకతరి మూర్ఖులను బోధించుట ఎవరికిని వశముకాదు. అట్టిసమయమున ఆత్మవంచన చేయుచున్నామే అను బాధ అవసరములేదు. ఆమూర్ఖులు చెప్పినదానికంతయు ఊకొట్టుటయే ఉత్తమ'మనెను.

"నెలవన్ను ముగిలన్ను హొలివరుంటెందరవ
హొలివరు హొలివరెన బేకు
మూర్ఖనలి కలహ బేడెంద సర్వజ్ఞ!"

ఈ భూమిని, ఆకాశమునుచేర్చి కుట్టగలవా రున్నారనిన అదెట్లసాధ్యమగునని యనక "కుట్టగలరు, కుట్టగలరు" అని చెప్పవలెను. మూర్ఖులతో కలహమేకూడదు. (మూర్ఖను ......అందందె, అన్ని) అని నొక్కి వక్కాణించెను[2].

" కండంతె హేళిదరె। కెండవాగువరు భూ
మండలదొళగె కండితవ నాడు వర।
కండిహుదె కష్టసర్వజ్ఞ ।"

'లోకములో జనులు నిజము చెప్పినవారిని గాంచినవెంటనే నిప్పువలె మండిపడుదురు. (యథార్థవాది బహుజన విరోధి కదా!) కాని ఆటువంటి ఖండిత వాదులను ఈ లోకమున కనుగొనుటయే కష్ట[3]'మని చెప్పెను.

'ఇటువంటి లౌకిక జ్ఞానము లేనినాడు మానవుడు ఈ లోకములో మెలగుట చాల కష్టము. మానవుడు ప్రతి విషయమందును విచక్షణా జ్ఞానము కలవాడై మెలగవలెను. మంచితనము, మహనీయత, మానవత్వము ఉండిన చాలును. అతని హృదయము సమస్త ధర్మములకు పీఠభూమి యగు'నని బోధించెను.

సర్వజ్ఞునిలోని ఈమహత్తర గుణ విశేషము లన్నియు అటుండ, ఇత డభిలషించిన 'నిరాడంబర ప్రశాంత గ్రామీణ జీవిత' మెట్టిదో కొంచెము తెలిసికొందము. ఇతడు మెచ్చిని

---

2. 'మూర్ఖుని మూర్ఖత మాన్ప వచ్చునే?' — భర్తృహరి

3. 'నిజము పల్కువాని నిందించు జగమెల్ల' — అను వేమనపద్యమున కిది చక్కని ప్రతిబింబ మనదగును.

ఇల్లు, వెచ్చమునకు ధనము, రెండెద్దులు, ఐదుగురు కొడుకులు, ఎల్లపుడు పాలిచ్చు ఆవు, వెనుదీయక పనిచేయు కోడండ్రు, ఒక ముసలి అవ్వ, మనస్సెరిగి మెలగు గుణవతియైన భార్య ఉండిన చాలు ననెను. స్వర్గమునకే చిచ్చు పెట్టవచ్చునని చెప్పెను. ఇది యథార్థమే కదా? సామాన్యుడగు రైతు కుటుంబము సుఖముగా, ప్రశాంతముగా జీవించుటకు ఇంతకంటె ఏమి కావలెను? దీనినిబట్టి సర్వజ్ఞుడు తృప్తిగల స్వభావము కలవాడని సుస్పష్టమగు చున్నది.

సర్వజ్ఞుని కాలమున గ్రామీణ కుటుంబ వ్యవస్థ ఏవిధముగా ఉండెడిదో ఈ వచనములనుబట్టి మనము తెలిసికొనుచున్నాము. ఆనాడు ఉమ్మడి కుటుంబ వ్యవస్థ సర్వసాధారణమైనది. రైతు కుటుంబములోని వారందరు (ఆబాలగోపాలము) బాధ్యతతో వ్యవహరించి శ్రమించుచు కల్ల కపటములేని జీవితమును గడుపుచుండెడివారు. గ్రామములోనున్న వివిధ వృత్తులకు చెందినవారు కూడ శ్రమమీద ఆధారపడి పరస్పర సహకార భావముతో మెలగుచుండిరి. స్వయంసమృద్ధితో ఆనాటి పల్లెలు శోభాయమానములుగా ఉండెడివి. శ్రమమీద ఆధారపడి జీవించుట యనునది సమాజవాద సిద్ధాంతములలో అత్యంత ముఖ్యమైనది. అటువంటి వ్యవస్థతో ఒప్పిన గృహములు ఆనందనిలయములై అలరారునని సర్వజ్ఞుని అభిప్రాయము. ఈ ఆదర్శ కుటుంబ వ్యవస్థ ఇతని కాలమున అచ్చటచ్చట కొంచెము సడలియున్నట్లుకూడా ఈవచనములబట్టి మన మూహింప వచ్చును. దాని పునరుద్ధరణమే సర్వజ్ఞుని ధ్యేయము. ఇతడు కూడ నూటికి నూరుపాళ్ళు వేమనవలె గ్రామీణుడని వేరుగా చెప్పనవసరము లేదుకదా?

కవి సృష్టికర్తతో సమానము. కవి ఋషితుల్యుడు. కవి సంఘసంస్కర్త, ఉత్తమ విమర్శకుడు, బోధకుడు, మహావిష్ణువువలె సర్వాంతర్యామి. మానవజీవితములో నితనికిసంబంధములేని విషయములేదు. ఇందులకు మన ప్రజాకవి సర్వజ్ఞుడే చక్కని నిదర్శనము. ఈ మహావ్యక్తినిగన్న కన్నడ భాషామాత సర్వవిధముల ధన్యురాలు.

Dr. CHANDRA PRAKASH AGARWAL

श्रीकृष्ण स्वरूप का क्रम विकास

श्रीमद्भागवत से बृन्दावनस्थ सम्प्रदायों तक श्रीकृष्ण का ऐश्वर्यमय स्वरूप विकसित होकर माधुर्यमय, लोक रक्षक स्वरूप से परिवर्तित होकर लोक रंजन स्वरूप और उपास्य स्वरूप से विकसित होकर उपासक स्वरूप बना। यह नवीनतम स्वरूप मुस्लिम वैष्णवों के हृदय को ग्राह्य हुआ।

श्रीकृष्ण स्वरूप का विकास सर्वतोमुखी हुआ है। भागवत के कृष्ण बुद्ध और ऋषभ के अंशी होने के कारण बौद्ध और जैन धर्म से सम्बन्धित हैं। आगामी गवेषकों को बौद्ध और जैन धर्मों के दृष्टिकोण से देखने पर भी श्रीकृष्ण का कोई स्वरूप अवश्य दृष्टिगोचर होना ऐसी लेखक की धारणा है। श्रीमद्भागवत में बौद्ध और ऋषभ पर समन्वय के दृष्टिकोण से दृष्टिपात किया गया है। इसीलिए बुद्ध और ऋषभ के दृष्टिकोणों से कृष्ण को भी समन्वित किया है[1]।

जिस प्रकार संसार का तिहाई भाग मसीह यीशु से प्रभावित है, और पंचम भाग भगवान बुद्ध से आज भी प्रभावित है, उसी प्रकार किसी समय समस्त संसार श्रीकृष्ण से प्रभावित रहा होगा – ऐसी लेखक की धारणा है। श्रीकृष्ण का संसार पर कहाँ, कब, क्यों, कैसे प्रभाव पड़ा इस विषय पर खोज होने की आवश्यकता है। जो बुद्ध श्रीकृष्ण के अंश थे, उनका प्रभाव आज भी संसार के पंचम भाग पर है। यदि अंशी कृष्ण का प्रभाव समस्त संसार पर रहा हो तो इसमें आश्चर्य की क्या बात।

---

1. "Brahmanism made of Buddha an avtar, a god. So did Buddhism"
— Nehru's Discovery of India, Third Edn., page 140.

श्रीकृष्ण का भारत समन्वय करने की एक असीम शक्ति रखता है[2]। ईरानी, यूनानी, पारथियन, बैकटीरियन, सिदियन, हून, तुर्क, इस्लामी, ईसाई, यहूदी एवं पारसी इस देश में आकर उसी प्रकार विलीन हो गये जैसे समुद्र में नदियाँ विलीन होकर अपना अस्तित्व खोकर समुद्रमय हो जाती हैं[3]। अतः हम कह सकते हैं कि भारत के कृष्ण ने संसार को अवश्य ही प्रभावित किया है।

धर्म का अर्थ ही है समन्वय[4]। प्राचीन काल में भारतीय धर्म को आर्य धर्म कहते थे, जो वैदिक एवं अवैदिक दोनों ही विचारधाराओं को मान्य था[5]।

केवल इतना ही नहीं, श्रीकृष्ण ने संसार को आदिकाल से प्रभावित किया है और अनन्तकाल तक प्रभावित करते रहेंगे। अत: हम आदिकाल से अब तक के श्रीकृष्ण के विभिन्न स्वरूपों के प्रभाव का अध्ययन करेंगे।

समय पर कृष्ण का प्रभाव

ऋग्वेद के समय में हैलेनिक, ईरानी और भारतीय आर्य सभ्यता समन्वित सी थी[6], जिसने यूनानी और पारसी रीति रिवाज को प्रभावित किया था।

भारतीय सभ्यता के आदिकाल को हम चार भागों में विभक्त करते हैं। प्रथम काल – ६००० ई. पू. काल को हम अदिति काल के नाम से पुकारते हैं[7]। द्वितीय काल-ओरियन काल का समय ५००० ई. पू. से ४००० ई. पू. तक माना जाता है। इस काल में ईश्वरीय प्रार्थनाओं की प्रधानता रही[8]। तृतीय काल-कृत्तिका काल २५०० ई. पू. से १४०० ई. पू. तक रहा। इस काल में तैत्तिरीय संहिता एवं ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थों का निर्माण हुआ[9]। चतुर्थकाल-प्राचीन संस्कृत साहित्य काल था जो १४०० ई. पू. से ५०० ई. पू. तक रहा। इस काल में सूत्र एवं दर्शन का निर्माण हुआ। तत्पश्चात बौद्ध धर्म की उन्नति हुई[10]।

---

2. J. Nehru's Discovery of India, 3rd Edn., page 53.
3. ibid. page 51.
4. ibid. page 52.
5. ibid. pages 51–52.
6. Vedas, published by the Society of Indian Literature, 65/2 Beadon St., Calcutta. 2nd Ed. (1898) page 29.
7. ibid. page 30.
8. ibid. page 31.
9. ibid. page 31
10. ibid. page 32.

अब हम अध्ययन करेंगे कि इस आदिकाल में श्रीकृष्ण के किस स्वरूप ने भारत को प्रभावित किया था।

ऋग्वेद में ईश्वर का स्वरूप सूर्य माना गया है[11]। ऋग्वेद की ऋचाओं में प्रकृति की शक्तियों की उपासना विभिन्न देवताओं के रूप में नहीं वरन एक परमात्मा के विभिन्न अंशों के रूप में की गई है[12]। यदा कदा सूर्य को ऋग्वेद में विष्णु कह कर वर्णित किया गया है[13]। विष्णु श्रीकृष्ण का स्वरूप है। अत: ऋग्वेद के समय श्रीकृष्ण ने सूर्य के रूप में भारत को प्रभावित किया।

श्वेत यजुर्वेद के समय में श्रीकृष्ण के नारायण स्वरूप ने भारत को प्रभावित किया था[14]। श्याम यजुर्वेद के समय में श्रीकृष्ण के वाराह अवतार ने भारत की रक्षा की थी[15]। इसी से छटी शताब्दी पूर्व छान्दोग्योपनिषद् में कृष्ण के नाम का उल्लेख है[16]। उस वैदिक काल में स्वर्ण मुद्राओं का प्रचलन था और भारतवासी समुद्र पार करके व्यापार करने जाया करते थे[17]। अत: वैदिककाल से ही कृष्ण के विष्णु स्वरूप का प्रभाव भारत के बाहर भी प्रसारित हुआ होगा और उसने बाह्य जगत को भी प्रभावित किया होगा। यह शोध का एक पृथक विषय है कि वैदिक काल में विष्णु ने संसार के किन-किन भागों को प्रभावित किया था।

इस वैदिक एवं उपनिषद् काल के पश्चात वह युग आया, जब बौद्ध एवं जैन धर्मों का जन्म हुआ तथा रामायण और महाभारत जैसे वीर काव्य लिखे गये[18]। बुद्ध और ऋषभ को कृष्ण अवतार श्रीमद्भागवत में मान लिया गया। रामायण में विष्णु ही राम के स्वरूप में प्रकट हुये। महाभारत और गीता में कृष्ण के वीर एवं उपदेशक स्वरूप क्रमश: प्राप्त ही हैं। ईसा पूर्व चौथी शताब्दी में कृष्ण को पूर्ण ब्रह्म मान लिया गया था[19]। छटी शताब्दी में विष्णु पुराण में श्रीकृष्ण की महिमा का प्रतिपादन किया गया है[20]। श्रीमद्भागवत ने 'कृष्णस्तु

11. ibid. page 37.
12. ibid. page 67.
13. ibid. page 70.
14. ibid. page 52.
15. ibid. page 59.
16. Loves of Krishna, by W.G. Archer, page 17.
17. Vedas, Second Edition, page 59.
18. Nehru's discovery of India, page 68.
19. Loves of Krishna, by W.G. Archer, page 17.
20. ibid. page 25.

भगवान् स्वयं' कहकर कृष्ण की महत्ता एवं भगवत्ता प्रतिपादित की[21]। श्रीमद्भागवत माहात्म्य (पद्मपुराण) में हमें भक्ति ज्ञान वैराग्य के रूपक में चतुर्सम्प्रदायों का संकेत प्राप्त होता है, जिनमें श्रीकृष्ण के विभिन्न स्वरूप प्राप्य होते हैं। तत्पश्चात् हिन्दी साहित्य में कृष्ण भक्ति शाखा भक्तिकाल स्वर्ण युग माना ही जाता है। भक्ति सम्प्रदायों की औपचारिक वृत्ति आगे चल कर जनता के अन्तःकरण के साथ समन्वय नहीं कर पाई, जिसका पूर्ण प्रतिबिम्ब हमें रीति कालीन कविता में प्राप्त होता है।

श्रीकृष्ण के एकांगी और संकीर्ण स्वरूप का सर्वांगीण विकास पुनः आधुनिक युग में प्रारम्भ हुआ। सर्वश्री अयोध्या सिंह उपाध्याय, मैथिली शरण गुप्त, कृष्णायन के लेखक श्री द्वारका प्रसाद मिश्र एवं दिनकर ने इस ओर प्रशंसनीय प्रयास कर सर्वांग सोलह कला सम्पन्न, लोक तत्व समन्वित विकास कर, कृष्ण स्वरूप को जनता के समक्ष पुनः प्रस्तुत किया। भविष्य में भी श्रीकृष्ण ही कल्कि भगवान के रूप में अवतार ग्रहण करेंगे[22]।

इस प्रकार हम श्रीकृष्ण को विभिन्न स्वरूपों द्वारा आदि से अन्त तक सृष्टि को प्रभावित करते हुये पाते हैं। अब हम देखेंगे कि संसार के किन-किन स्थानों एवं धर्म पर श्रीकृष्ण का प्रभाव पड़ा।

विश्व संस्कृति पर कृष्ण का प्रभाव

वैदिक काल में ही हिन्दू धर्म का प्रभाव पारसी धर्म पर पडा था। दोनों धर्मों में विचार साम्य था। दोनों धर्म एक दूसरे से अनेक प्रकार से सम्बन्धित थे[23]।

पारसी धर्म के प्रवर्तक जारातुशतर मसीह यीशु से कई हजार वर्ष पूर्व हुए थे। श्रीकृष्ण भी मसीह यीशु से कई हजार वर्ष पूर्व अवतरित हुये थे। जारातुशतर के विषय में वैसी ही कहानियाँ प्रचलित हैं, जैसी कृष्ण के विषय में। दोनों के जीवन में परम साम्य है। जारातुशतर उस समय संसार में अवतरित हुये जब संसार में बुराई और अत्याचार का साम्राज्य था और वहाँ का शासक अत्याचारी था। ठीक इसी प्रकार कृष्ण के जन्म काल के समय भी अत्याचारी कंस राज्य करता था। उक्त अत्याचारी शासक ने बालक जारातुशतर को मारने

21. ibid. page 24.
22. Shrimad Bhāgawat 12-2-18.
23. The Theosophist Review, dated 17-11-65, page 37.

की ठीक उसी प्रकार चेष्टा की जैसे कंस ने कृष्ण को मारने की चेष्टा की थी, किन्तु वह बालक प्रत्येक बार बच गया[24]।

वास्तव में कृष्ण और जारातुशतर के जीवन में घनिष्ठ साम्य है और इस प्रकार कृष्ण ने पारसी धर्म पर एक अमिट प्रभाव छोडा।

इस प्राचीन पारसी धर्म का प्रभाव ईसाई और यहूदी धर्मों पर पडा[25]। इस प्रकार श्रीकृष्ण ने पारसी धर्म के द्वारा ईसाई एवं यहूदी धर्मों को प्रभावित किया।

थेसॉफिस्ट सोसाइटी के मतानुसार जब क्राइस्ट ३२ वर्ष के थे तब तीन वर्ष तक अन्तर्ध्यान रहे। अपने इस प्रवास काल में वे तिब्बत में रहे थे। ईसाई धर्म हिन्दुत्व की बेटी है। मसीह यीशु की भक्ति दासभाव की है। कृष्ण और क्राइस्ट ने समान रूप से प्रेम का प्रतिपादन किया। कृष्ण ने जो प्रेम भारत को प्रदान किया वही प्रेम क्राइस्ट ने यूरोप को प्रदान किया, किन्तु कृष्ण के उपदेश जितने गम्भीर हैं, उतने गम्भीर क्राइस्ट के उपदेश नहीं[26]। कृष्ण, क्राइस्ट और मैत्रेयजी ही विश्व के रक्षक हैं।

हजरत मोहम्मद ने यहूदी, ईसाई और पारसी धर्म माननेवालों से भ्रातृत्व, शान्ति, मित्रता एवं भलाई का व्यवहार किया[27]। इस प्रकार ईसाई, यहूदी एवं पारसी धर्मों के द्वारा मोहम्मद साहब का कृष्ण चरित्र से प्रभावित होना असम्भव नहीं हो सकता। भारत का प्रभाव काबुल पर भी पड़ा[28]।

पांचों तत्व विष्णु की सेवा करते हैं और वे विष्णु के आधिपत्य में हैं। पृथिवी ने प्रार्थना करते हुये कहा, "श्री भागवत! चार तत्व सदैव आपके पास रहते हैं; आकाश शंख के रूप में, वायु चक्र के रूप में, अग्नि गदा के रूप में और पद्म कमल के रूप में आपकी सेवा करते हैं। मैं भी आपके चरणों का स्पर्श कर आपकी सेवा किया करती हूँ[29]।

24. ibid. page 37.
25. ibid. page 41.
26. A lecture delivered in Theosophical Jyoti Lodge, Farrukhabad. U.P.
27. The Theosophist Review, dated 17-11-65, pages 26-27.
28. The Outline of Knowledge, Vol. IX, page 139
29. The Institutes of Vishnu, Translated by Julius Jolly (Sacred Books of the East, Edited by H. Max Muller, Vol. VII) published by The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1880 Edn., page 291.

विष्णु ने अपने मित्र[30] इन्द्र के माध्यम से यूनान देश को प्रभावित किया[31]। विष्णु पत्नी लक्ष्मी की भांति ही यूनान की देवी 'एफ्रोडाइट' क्षीर सागर से उत्पन्न हुई थी[32]। उपर्युक्त वाक्य जिस पुस्तक के आधार पर लिखा गया है वह अमेरिका में प्रकाशित हुई थी। अत: अमेरिका के पाठकों को भी कृष्ण के विष्णु स्वरूप का ज्ञान है।

श्रीकृष्ण के मत्स्य अवतार ने देश एवं विदेशों को प्रभावित किया। मत्स्य अवतार का सम्बन्ध इस प्रदेश के द्रविड राजा एवं विदेश के राजा नूह से बताया जाता है[33]। मत्स्य अवतार की कथा उत्तरी जर्मन की तत्सम्बन्धी कथा से पूर्ण साम्य रखती है[34]। मत्स्य अवतार ने चेलंडियन और बाइबिल को भी प्रभावित किया है[35]।

फ्रान्सीसी विद्वान इस कथा को बेबीलोन से सम्बन्धित बताते हैं[36]। जल प्रलय का अवस्था और वेद में उल्लेख हैं[37]।

खोजियों का विश्वास है कि अरब और शाम की शामी सभ्यता भारत से ही पश्चिम की ओर गई। शामियों के आदिपुरुष आदिम स्वर्ग से च्युत हो दक्षिण भारत (सरन द्वीप) में ही उतारे गये। वहाँ वर्षों तप करने के बाद अन्तर आत्मा की प्रेरणा से वह अरब आये। वहाँ उन्होंने काबा का निर्माण किया और उसमें शिवलिंग की स्थापना की। कहा जाता है कि जल प्रलय के बाद आदिम का शव यरुसलेम लाया गया[38]।

अशोक ने २६७ ई. पू. प्रचारकों को सीरिया, मिश्र, यूनान और लंका भेजा। मसीह यीशु के उत्पन्न होने से पूर्व ही तिब्बत, चीन, कोरिया और

---

30. The Story of Nations (Vedic India) by Z.A. Ragozin Third Ed. Published by T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square, London, Pages 240-241.
31. The Outline of Knowledge Vol. II (Religion and Historical Romance) by Frederick H. Mortons, published by J.A. Richards Inc. New York (U.S.A.) 1924 Edn., Page 114.
32. ibid. page 119.
33. Story of Nations (Vedic India) Pages 343 and 346.
34. ibid. Page 347.
35. ibid. Pages 339, 342 and 346.
36. ibid. Page 344.
37. Malik Mohd. Jayasi: Ek Adhyayan, Kitab Mahal 1st. Edn., (Hindi) page 3.
38. ibid.

जापान में बौद्ध धर्म का प्रचार हो चुका था। भगवान बुद्ध श्रीकृष्ण ही का अवतार थे[39]।

इतिहास से पता चलता है कि अनेक बौद्ध मिश्र सीरिया में पहुंच गये थे। बसरा प्रान्त (ईरान) पर तो भारत का प्रभाव इतना अधिक था कि अरब उसे हिन्द का अंग समझते थे[40]। मसीह के गुरु यूहन्ना ऐसीन सम्प्रदाय के थे। इस मत में एक चौथा अंश यहूदियों का था, तीन चौथाई बौद्धों का[41]।

ब्रिटेन का पाठक कृष्ण के दोनों स्वरूपों (मुरलीधर कृष्ण और गीता के उपदेशक कृष्ण) से भली भांति परिचित हैं[42]। कृष्ण के प्रेमी स्वरूप से कुछ अंग्रेज़ इतने अधिक मंत्र मुग्ध हैं कि वे गीता के कृष्ण को सुनकर आश्चर्य चकित रह जाते हैं[43]। ठीक इसी प्रकार कुछ अंग्रेज़ जो गीता के कृष्ण से परिचित हैं वे कृष्ण के प्रेमी स्वरूप की जानकारी कर के चकित हो जाते हैं[44]।

श्रीकृष्ण के प्रेमी स्वरूप से साम्य रखने वाले प्रेमपरक् काव्य का एकादश एवं द्वादश शताब्दी में फ्रान्स एवं जर्मनी में जन्म हुआ[45]।

राधाकृष्ण के प्रेम की तुलना ईसाई धर्म में जीव और ब्रह्म के प्रेम से तुलना की गई है। स्पेन् के रहस्यवादी सन्त जान ने भी इसी प्रकार के विचार प्रकट किये हैं[46]।

बारहवी शताब्दी में कृष्ण-प्रेम की स्रोतस्विनी बंगाल में जयदेव की वाणी से गीतगोविन्द के द्वारा प्रस्फुटित हुई,[47] जिसके कारण कृष्ण का प्रभाव उत्तर पश्चिम भारत पर पडा[48]।

बंगाल में वैष्णव कवियों ने, दक्षिण भारत में आलवार सन्तों ने, उत्तर प्रदेश में अष्टछाप के कवियों ने, उड़ीसा में 'पंच सखा' सम्प्रदाय ने, राजस्थान में

---

39. Outline of Knowledge Vol. II. (Religion and Historical Romance, page 127.
40. Malik Mohd. Jayasi : Ek Adhyayan, by Ram Ratan Bhatnager, page 7.
41. ibid. page 6.
42. Loves of Krishna, by W.G. Archer, page 14.
43. ibid. page 15.
44. ibid.
45. ibid. Page 118, Note No. 17.
46. ibid. page 75.
47. ibid. page 76.
48. ibid. page 84.

मीरा ने, आसाम में शंकरदेव ने एवं महाराष्ट्र में नामदेव एवं तुकाराम ने श्रीकृष्ण के प्रभाव की श्री बुद्धि की[49] ।

बिल्वमंगलाचार्य के काव्य द्वारा श्रीकृष्ण ने पश्चिमी भारत को प्रभावित किया[50] । िबाई के काव्य के माध्यम से श्रीकृष्ण ने राजस्थान को प्रभावित किया ।

इस प्रकार श्रीमद्भागवत से वृन्दावनस्थ सम्प्रदायों तक श्रीकृष्ण का जो ऐश्वर्य से माधुर्य मण्डित स्वरूप, लोक रक्षक से लोक रंजन स्वरूप तथा उपास्य से उपासक स्वरूप विकसित हुआ, उसने समस्त भारत को ही नहीं वरन् विदेशों को भी प्रभावित किया ।

बृन्दावनस्थ सम्प्रदायों के अतिरिक्त भी कृष्ण भक्ति शाखा के अन्तर्गत नाना प्रकार के सम्प्रदाय हैं, जिन्हों ने अपने साहित्य एवं काव्य के माध्यम से श्रीकृष्ण के प्रभाव को विस्तृत किया है । दत्तात्रेय सम्प्रदाय ने महाराष्ट्र में, मध्व सम्प्रदाय ने कनारा (दक्षिण भारत) में विष्णुस्वामी ने त्रावणकूर एवं त्रिवेन्द्रम में श्रीकृष्ण के प्रभाव को बढ़ाया[51] ।

कृष्ण भक्ति शाखा के मुस्लिम कवियों ने भी अपने काव्य के द्वारा श्रीकृष्ण के गुण गान कर श्रीकृष्ण के यश और प्रभाव का विस्तार किया ।

उदाहरणार्थ :-

ग्रियर्सन का कथन है कि ये (अहमद्) सूफ़ी थे, पर इनकी रचनाओं में वैष्णव धर्म की ही छाप है[52] ।

रहीम के ग्रन्थों में 'मदनाष्टक' और 'रास पंचाध्यायी' प्रसिद्ध हैं । मुस्लिम होते हुये भी उन में हिन्दू धर्म ऐसी छाप थी कि उससे किसी प्रकार की भी कृत्रिमता नहीं प्रकट होती है[53] ।

---

49. ibid.
50. ibid. page 84.
51. Hindi Sahitya Ka Alochanatmak Itihas, by Dr. Ram Kumar Verma, 4th Edn., page 607.
52. ibid. page 596.
53. ibid. page 600.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

1. Dr. Umesh Chandra Sharma ... Senior Research Fellow,
Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit,
University of Poona,
Poona-7.

2. Dr. M.S. Narayana Murti ... Lecturer in Sanskrit,
S.V.U.O.R. Institute,
Tirupati.

3. Dr. T. Kodandaramaiah ... Professor of Telugu,
Madurai University,
Madurai-2.

4. Dr. Ramesh Sundarji Betai ... Reader in Sanskrit,
Gujarat Vidyapeeth,
Ahamadabad-14.

5. Dr. N. Subbu Reddiyar ... Head of the Department of Tamil,
S.V. University,
Tirupati.

6. Dr. Shri Narayana Mishra ... Department of Sanskrit and Pali,
Benares Hindu University,
Varanasi.

7. Dr. M.D. Paradkar ... Principal,
Sonopant Dandekar College of Arts and Commerce,
Palghar.

8. Dr. P.S.R. Appa Rao ... Director,
Telugu Akademi,
Himayatnagar,
Hyderabad.

9. Dr. K.S. Ramamurti ... Lecturer in Sanskrit and Curator-in-charge, S.V.U.O.R. Institute,
Tirupati.

10. Sri N.S.Ramanuja Tatacharya... Reader,
Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha,
Tirupati.

11. Sri P. Balakrishna Murti ... Principal,
S.B.S. Oriental College (Retired),
Vakadu,
Nellore District.

12. Dr. G. Appa Rao ... Lecturer in Telugu,
University of Madras,
Madras.

13. Dr. Chandra Prakash Agarwal... Ex-Magistrate,
Kedarnath Street,
Farrukhabad (U.P.).

PUBLICATIONS OF
S.V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
TIRUPATI

The following is the list of publications available for sale at prices mentioned against them. S.V. University Oriental Journal is the only multi-lingual publication. It contains articles in English, Sanskrit and Telugu. In some of the numbers articles in Tamil or Hindi also are published

S.No.	Particulars of Work			Price
				Rs. Ps.
1.	S.V. University Oriental Journal	Vol. I	Parts 1 & 2 (1958)	10-00
2.	-do-	Vol. VII	Parts 1 & 2 (1964)	10-00
3.	-do-	Vol. VIII	Parts 1 & 2 (1965)	10-00
4.	-do-	Vol. IX	Parts 1 & 2 (1966)	10-00
5.	-do-	Vol. X	Parts 1 & 2 (1967)	10-00
6.	-do-	Vol. XI	Parts 1 & 2 (1968)	10-00
7.	-do-	Vol. XII	Parts 1 & 2 (1969)	10-00
8.	-do-	Vol. XIII	Parts 1 & 2 (1970)	10-00
9.	-do-	Vol. XIV	Parts 1 & 2 (1971) separately	15-00
10.	Gajagrahaṇaprakāra of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita Edited with Introduction by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.		1968	2-50
11.	Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇyasādhanam of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda Edited with Introduction, English Translation and Notes by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.		1968	0-75
12.	Kāvyāmṛtam of Srīvatsalāñchana Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.		1971	3-25
13.	Kamalāvilāsabhāṇa of Nārāyaṇakavi Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.		1971	0-50
14.	Vijayavikramavyāyoga of Āryasūrya Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.		1972	1-00
15.	Vedāntasāracintāmaṇi of Sītārāmaśāstrin Edited with Introduction by Dr. M.S. Narayana Murti, M.A., Ph.D.		1973	Price to be fixed

16. An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit, Telugu and Tamil Manuscripts (Palm-leaf and Paper) in the Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Research Institute Library, Tirupati. 1956 10-00

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

17. Pradyumnacaritramu (Telugu) of Muppirāla Subbarāyakavi
    Edited with Introduction and Notes by
    Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A.,Ph.D.

18. Kṛṣṇavilāsa (a Kāvya in 11 cantos) of Puṇyakoṭi with Vyākhyāna
    Edited with Introduction by
    Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A.,Ph.D.

19. Pādukāpaṭṭābhiṣeka of Nārāyaṇakavi
    Edited with Introduction by
    Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.

20. Proceedings of the Seminar on "Andhras' Contribution to Indian Culture"
    Edited by
    Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D.

---

1. All the above Publications are now supplied only on pre-payment of cost and postage either by money-order or demand draft, payable to the Registrar of this University.

   This condition of pre-payment may be relaxed to some extent in the case of Registered Publishers, Local Library Authorities, Universities, Affiliated Colleges and other recognised Educational Institutions in India on correspondence. A nominal discount of 5% to 10% may be allowed to them on their own merits.

2. A trade discount of 25% is allowed to all the Registered Booksellers only.

3. The annual subscription rates of the S. V. University Oriental Journal are as follows :

   1. Inland ... Rs. 15/– (Post free)
   2. Foreign* ... £ 1 and 15 shillings or 4 Dollars.

   *The Journal is sent post free by Surface mail, but if the party requires it to be despatched by air-mail, the air-mail charges have to be borne by the party.

N.B: The foreign rates of volumes I to XIII are 20 Shillings or 2 Dollars and 50 cents.

Statement of ownership and other particulars about Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal

FORM IV

(See Rule 8)

1.	Place of publication	...	Sri Venkateswara Universty Oriental Research Institute, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh.
2.	Periodicity of its publication	...	Half Yearly.
3.	Printer's Name	...	Sri M.K. Ramakrishnan, M A., Registrar, S.V. University.
	Nationality	...	Indian.
	Address	...	S.V. University Press, Tirupati.
4.	Publisher's name	...	Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M A., Ph.D.
	Nationality	...	Indian.
	Address	...	Director, S.V.U.O.R. Institute, Tirupati.
5.	Editor's name	...	Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D.
	Nationality	...	Indian.
	Address	...	Director, S.V.U.O.R. Institute, Tirupati.
6.	Name and address of individuals who own the periodical.	...	Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati.

I, Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

J. CHENNA REDDY,
Publisher.

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL JOURNAL
TIRUPATI

1. The Journal is the official organ of the Sri Venkateswara University
2. Each volume of the journal appears in 2 Parts—Part I in June and Part 2 in December.
3. Contributions on indological subjects and oriental culture are accepted from the reputed scholars mainly in three languages–English, Sanskrit and Telugu.
4. Each contribution must be legibly and clearly written or typewritten on only one side of the paper and sent made completely press ready.
5. The Editor reserves to himself the right of accepting, rejecting or modifying any contribution received for publication. Contributors are advised to keep copies of their articles as the editor does not undertake the responsibility to return the rejected articles.
6. Every author will receive 25 off-prints of his or her article free of charge besides a copy of the issue of the journal containing that particular article.
7. Books on Indology in English, Sanskrit, Dravidian languages and Hindi are reviewed in the Journal. Two copies of the books intended for review are to be sent to the Editor.
8. All enquiries and communications regarding the editing and publishing of the Journal should be addressed to

The Editor,
S. V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL JOURNAL
TIRUPATI - 517502
(Andhra Pradesh), South India.

Printed by : The Registrar, S.V. University at the S.V. University Press, Tirupati, 15-11-1973. 300 copies.

Published by : Prof. J. CHENNA REDDY, M.A., Ph.D., Director, S.V. University Oriental Research Institute, Tirupati.